arXiv:0803.1815v1 [math.PR] 12 Mar 2008

BSDEs with two RCLL Reflecting Obstacles driven by a Brownian Motion and Poisson Measure and related Mixed Zero-Sum Games

S.Hamadène and H.Wang
Laboratoire de Statistique et Processus,
Université du Maine, 72085 Le Mans Cedex 9, France
e-mails: hamadene@univ-lemans.fr & hao.wang.etu@univ-lemans.fr

March 12, 2008

Abstract

In this paper we study Backward Stochastic Differential Equations with two reflecting right continuous with left limits obstacles (or barriers) when the noise is given by Brownian motion and a Poisson random measure mutually independent. The jumps of the obstacle processes could be either predictable or inaccessible. We show existence and uniqueness of the solution when the barriers are completely separated and the generator uniformly Lipschitz. We do not assume the existence of a difference of supermartingales between the obstacles. As an application, we show that the related mixed zero-sum differential-integral game problem has a value.

AMS Classification subjects: 91A15, 91B74, 60G40, 91A60

Key Words: Backward stochastic differential equation ; penalization ; Mokobodski's hypothesis ; Snell envelope ; zero-sum mixed differential-integral game.

1 Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with the problem of existence and uniqueness of a solution for the backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs for short) driven by a Brownian motion and an independent Poisson measure with two reflecting obstacles (or barriers) which are right continuous with left limits (*rcll* for short) processes. Roughly speaking we look for a quintuple of adapted processes

$(Y, Z, V, K^{\pm})$ such that:

$$\begin{cases} (i)\, Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s, V_s)ds + (K_T^+ - K_t^+) - (K_T^- - K_t^-) - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E V_s(e)\widetilde{\mu}(ds, de) \\ (ii)\, L \leq Y \leq U \text{ and if } K^{c,\pm} \text{ is the continuous part of } K^{\pm} \text{ then} \\ \qquad \int_0^T (Y_t - L_t)dK_t^{c,+} = \int_0^T (U_t - Y_t)dK_t^{c,-} = 0 \\ (iii) \text{ if } K^{d,\pm} \text{ is the purely discontinuous part of } K^{\pm} \text{ then } K^{d,\pm} \text{ is predictable and} \\ \qquad K_t^{d,-} = \sum_{0<s\leq t} (Y_s - U_{s-})^+ 1_{[\Delta U_s > 0]} \text{ and } K_t^{d,+} = \sum_{0<s\leq t} (Y_s - L_{s-})^- 1_{[\Delta L_s < 0]} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where B is a Brownian motion, $\tilde{\mu}$ is a compensated Poisson random measure and $f(t, \omega, y, z, v)$, ξ, L and U are given (B and $\tilde{\mu}$ are independent).

In the framework of a Brownian filtration, the notion of BSDEs with one reflecting obstacle is introduced by El-Karoui et al. [12]. Those equations have been well considered during the last ten years since they have found a wide range of applications especially in finance, stochastic control/games, partial differential equations,.... Later Cvitanic & Karatzas generalized in [8] the setting of [12] where they introduced BSDEs with two reflecting barriers. Since then there were several articles on this latter types of BSDEs (see *e.g.* [2, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 32, 33] and the references therein), usually in connection with various applications. Nevertheless during several years, the existence of a solution of two barrier reflected BSDEs is obtained under one of the two following hypotheses: either one of the obstacles is "almost" a semimartingale (see *e.g.* [8, 22]) or the so-called Mokobodski's condition (see (3) for its definition) [8, 21, 28, 32, 33] holds. Obviously the first assumption is somehow restrictive as for the second one it is quite difficult to check in practice. Those conditions have been removed in [17] where the authors showed that if the barriers are continuous and completely separated, *i.e.* $\forall t \leq T,\ L_t < U_t$, then the two barrier reflected BSDE has a solution. Later the case of discontinuous barriers has been also studied in Hamadène et al. [19] where they actually show the existence of a solution when the obstacles and their left limits are completely separated.

In this work, we focus on BSDEs with two reflecting barriers when, on the one hand, the filtration is generated by a Brownian motion and an independent Poisson random measure and, on the other hand, the barriers are *rcll* processes whose jumps are arbitrary, they can be either predictable or inaccessible. We show that when the generator of the BSDE is Lipschitz, the obstacle processes and their left limits are completely separated then the BSDE (1) has a unique solution. Therefore our work is an extension of the one by Hamadène & Hassani [18] where they deal with the same framework of BSDEs except that the obstacle processes are not allowed to have predictable jumps. This work generalizes also the paper in [19] where the two barrier reflecting BSDE they consider is driven only by a Brownian motion. The main difficulty of our problem lies in the fact that the jumps of the obstacles can be predictable or inaccessible, therefore the component Y of the solution has also both types of jumps. This is the basic difference of our work related to [18] (resp. [19]) where Y has only inaccessible (resp. predictable)

jumps.

It is well known that double barrier reflected BSDEs are connected with mixed zero-sum games (see *e.g.* [16, 21]). Therefore as an application of our result obtained in the first part of the paper, in the second part we deal with zero-sum mixed stochastic differential-integral games which we describe briefly. Assume we have a system on which intervene two agents (or players) c_1 and c_2. This system could be a stock in the market and then c_1, c_2 are two traders whose advantages are antagonistic. The intervention of the agents have two forms, control and stopping. The dynamics of the system when controlled is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x_t \quad &= x_0 + \int_0^t f(s, x_s, u_s, v_s)ds + \int_0^t \int_E \gamma(s, e, x_{s-})\beta(s, e, x_{s-}, u_s, v_s)\lambda(de)ds \\ &\qquad + \int_0^t \sigma(s, x_s)dB_s + \int_0^t \int_E \gamma(s, e, x_{s-})\widetilde{\mu}(ds, de), \ t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

The agent c_1 (resp. c_2) controls the system with the help of the process u (resp. v) up to the time when she decides to stop controlling at τ (resp. σ), a stopping time. Then the control of the system is stopped at $\tau \wedge \sigma$, that is to say, when one of the agents decides first to stop controlling. As noticed above, the advantages of the agents are antagonistic, *i.e.*, there is a payoff $J(u, \tau; v, \sigma)$ between them which is a cost (resp. a reward) for c_1 (resp. c_2). The payoff depends on the process $(x_t)_{t \leq T}$ and is the sum of two parts, an instantaneous and terminal payoffs (see (28) for its definition). Therefore the agent c_1 aims at minimizing $J(u, \tau; v, \sigma)$ while c_2 aims at maximizing the same payoff. In the particular case of agents who have non control actions, the mixed game is just the well known Dynkin game which is studied by several authors (see e.g. [27, 29, 37] and the references therein). Also in this paper we show that this game has a value, *i.e.*, the following relation holds true:

$$\inf_{(u,\tau)} \sup_{(v,\sigma)} J(u, \tau; v, \sigma) = \sup_{(v,\sigma)} \inf_{(u,\tau)} J(u, \tau; v, \sigma).$$

The value of the game is expressed by means of a solution of a BSDE with two reflecting barriers with a specific generator.

In the case when the filtration is Brownian (*i.e.* the process $(x_t)_{t \leq T}$ has no jumps), the zero-sum mixed differential game is completely solved in [16] in its general setting. However according to our knowledge the problem of zero-sum mixed differential-integral game still open. Therefore our work completes and closes this problem of zero-sum stochastic games of diffusion processes with jumps.

In a financial market zero-sum games are related to recallable options and convertible bonds. Recallable options (or israeli options in Kifer's terminology [25]) are American options where the issuer of the option has also the right to recall it if she accepts to pay at least the value of the option in the market. Therefore we have a zero-sum game between the issuer and the holder of the option (see *e.g.* [16, 24, 25] for more details on this subject). A convertible bond is a financial instrument, in general issued by firms, with the following provisions: it pays a fixed amount at maturity like a bond and pays coupons ; it can be converted by the bondholder for stock or can be called by the firm. Therefore

as a game option, this makes also a zero-sum game between the issuer and the bondholder (see *e.g.* [1, 15, 35] and the references therein for the literature on convertible bonds). Also another problem that can motivate the mixed zero-sum game we consider is the pricing of American game options or convertible bonds under Knightian uncertainty (see e.g. [26]) with or without defautable risk of the underlyings [6, 7]. We will come back to this topic in a forthcoming paper.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the problem and we recall some results related to BSDEs with one reflecting discontinuous *rcll* barrier. In Section 3, we introduce the increasing and decreasing penalization schemes and we prove their convergence. Later we show that the limits of those schemes are the same and provides the so-called *local solution* for the two barrier reflected BSDE. In Section 4 we give the main result of this paper (Theorem 4.2), where we establish the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (1) when the obstacles and their left limits are completely separated. We first begin to consider the case when f does not depend on (y, z, v) and in using results of Section 3 (Theorem 4.1) we show that existence/uniqueness, then we switch to the case where f depends only on y and we use a fixed point argument to state the existence of a solution for (1) (Proposition 4.2), finally we deal with the general case. At the end, in Section 5 we solve the mixed zero-sum differential-integral game problem as an application of our study. □

2 Setting of the problem and preliminary results

Throughout this paper, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\leq T}, P)$ is a stochastic basis such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all P-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{t+} := \bigcap_{\epsilon>0} \mathcal{F}_{t+\epsilon} = \mathcal{F}_t$, $\forall t < T$. Moreover we assume that the filtration is generated by the following two mutually independent processes:

- a d-dimensional Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t\leq T}$,

- a Poisson random measure μ on $R^+ \times E$, where $E := R^l \backslash \{0\}$ $(l \geq 1)$ is equipped with its Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{E}$, with compensator $\nu(dt, de) = dt\lambda(de)$, such that $\widetilde{\mu}([0, t] \times A) = (\mu - \nu)([0, t] \times A)_{t\leq T}$ is a martingale for every $A \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfying $\lambda(A) < \infty$. The measure λ is assumed to be a σ-finite on $(E, \mathcal{E})$ and integrates the function $(1 \wedge |e|^2)_{e\in E}$. Besides let us define:

- $\mathcal{P}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}^d$) the σ-algebra of $\mathcal{F}_t$-progressively measurable (resp. predictable) sets on $[0, T] \times \Omega$;

- $\mathcal{H}^k$ $(k \geq 1)$ the set of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable processes $Z = (Z_t)_{t\leq T}$ with values in R^k such that $P - a.s.$, $\int_0^T |Z_s(\omega)|^2 ds < \infty$; $\mathcal{H}^{2,k}$ is the subset of the set of $\mathcal{H}^k$ of processes $Z = (Z_t)_{t\leq T}$ $dt \otimes dP$-square integrable ;

- $\mathcal{S}^2$ the set of $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted *rcll* processes $Y = (Y_t)_{t\leq T}$ such that $E[\sup_{t\leq T} |Y_t|^2] < \infty$;

-$\mathcal{L}$ the set of $\mathcal{P}^d \bigotimes \mathcal{E}$-measurable mappings $V : \Omega \times [0, T] \times E \to R$ such that $P - a.s.$, $\int_0^T ds \int_E (V_s(\omega, e))^2 \lambda(de) < \infty$; $\mathcal{L}^2$ is the subset of $\mathcal{L}$ which contains the mappings $V(t, \omega, e)$ which are $dt \times dP \times d\lambda$-square integrable ;

- $\mathcal{A}$ the set of $\mathcal{P}^d$-measurable, *rcll* non-decreasing processes $K = (K_t)_{t\leq T}$ such that $K_0 = 0$ and $P-a.s.$, $K_T < \infty$; we denote by $\mathcal{A}^2$ the subset of $\mathcal{A}$ which contains processes K such that $E[K_T^2] < \infty$ and by $\mathcal{A}^{2,c}$ the subset of $\mathcal{A}^2$ which contains only continuous processes ;

- for $\pi = (\pi_t)_{t\leq T} \in \mathcal{S}^2$, $\pi_- := (\pi_{t-})_{t\leq T}$ is the process of its left limits, *i.e.*, $\forall t > 0, \pi_{t-} = lim_{s\nearrow t}\pi_s$ ($\pi_{0-} = \pi_0$). On the other hand, we denote by $\Delta\pi_t = \pi_t - \pi_{t-}$ the size of the jump of π at t ;

- a stopping time τ is called predictable if there exists a sequence $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of stopping times such that $\tau_n \leq \tau$ that are strictly smaller than τ on $\{\tau > 0\}$ and increase to τ everywhere ; a stopping time ζ is called completely inaccessible if for any predictable stopping time τ, $P[\tau = \zeta] = 0$; the set of $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping times ς which take their values in $[t, T]$ is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_t$. □

We are now given four objects:

(i) a function $f : (t, \omega, y, z, v) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times R^{1+d} \times L^2(E, \mathcal{E}, \lambda; R) \longmapsto f(t, \omega, y, z, v) \in R$ such that $(f(t, \omega, y, z, v))_{t\leq T}$ is $\mathcal{P}$-measurable for any $(y, z, v) \in R^{1+d} \times L^2(E, \mathcal{E}, \lambda; R))$ and $(f(t, \omega, 0, 0, 0))_{t\leq T}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{2,1}$. Moreover we assume that f is uniformly Lipschitz with respect to (y, z, v), *i.e.*, there exists a constant C_f (when there is no ambiguity we omit f at the index) such that:

$$P-a.s.\ |f(t, y, z, v) - f(t, y', z', v')| \leq C_f(|y - y'| + |z - z'| + ||v - v'||),\ \text{for any } t, y, y', z, z', v \text{ and } v'$$

(ii) a random variable ξ which belongs to $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, dP)$

(iii) two barriers $L := (L_t)_{t\leq T}$ and $U := (U_t)_{t\leq}$ processes of $\mathcal{S}^2$ which satisfy:

$$P-a.s., \forall t \leq T,\ L_t \leq U_t \text{ and } L_T \leq \xi \leq U_T.$$

A solution for the BSDE, driven by the Brownian motion B and the independent Poisson random measure μ, with two reflecting *rcll* barriers associated with (f, ξ, L, U) is a quintuple $(Y, Z, V, K^+, K^-) := (Y_t, Z_t, V_t, K_t^+, K_t^-)_{t\leq T}$ of processes with values in $R^{1+d} \times L^2_R(E, \mathcal{E}, \lambda) \times R^{1+1}$ such that: $\forall t \leq T$,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} (i)\ Y \in \mathcal{S}^2, K^{\pm} \in \mathcal{A}, Z \in \mathcal{H}^d \text{ and } V \in \mathcal{L} \\ (ii)\, Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s, V_s)ds + (K_T^+ - K_t^+) - \\ \qquad\qquad (K_T^- - K_t^-) - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E V_s(e)\widetilde{\mu}(ds, de), \forall t \leq T \\ (iii)\, L \leq Y \leq U \text{ and if } K^{c,\pm} \text{ is the continuous part of } K^{\pm} \text{ then} \\ \qquad \int_0^T (Y_t - L_t)dK_t^{c,+} = \int_0^T (U_t - Y_t)dK_t^{c,-} = 0 \\ (iv)\, \text{if } K^{d,\pm} \text{ is the purely discontinuous part of } K^{\pm} \text{ then } K^{d,\pm} \text{ is predictable and} \\ \qquad K_t^{d,-} = \sum_{0<s\leq t} (Y_s - U_{s-})^+ 1_{[\Delta U_s > 0]} \text{ and } K_t^{d,+} = \sum_{0<s\leq t} (Y_s - L_{s-})^- 1_{[\Delta L_s < 0]} \ ; \end{array}\right. \tag{2}$$

here $x^+ = max\{x, 0\}$ and $x^- = -min\{x, 0\}$ for any $x \in R$.

First let us notice that obviously for arbitrary barriers L and U this equation does not have a solution. Actually, if for example, L and U coincide and L is not a semimartingale then we cannot find

a semimartingale which equals to L. However as pointed out in the introduction, under Mokobodski's condition which reads as:

$$\textbf{[Mk]:}\ \begin{cases} \text{there exist two supermartingales of } \mathcal{S}^2, (h_t)_{t\leq T} \text{ and } (\theta_t)_{t\leq T} \text{ which satisfy} \\ \qquad P-a.s.,\ \forall t\leq T,\ h_t\geq 0,\ \theta_t\geq 0 \text{ and } L_t\leq h_t-\theta_t\leq U_t, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

there are several works which establish existence/uniqueness of a solution for (2) (see e.g. [18]). So the main objective of this work is to provide conditions on L and U as general as possible and easy to verify under which equation (2) has a solution. Actually in Theorem 4.2 below we show that if the barriers L and U are completely separated then the BSDE (2) associated with (f,ξ,L,U) has a unique solution. This condition is minimal. □

To begin with we will focus on uniqueness of the solution of (2). Then we have:

Proposition 2.1 *: The RBSDE (2) has at most one solution, i.e., if* (Y,Z,V,K^+,K^-) *and* (Y',Z',V',K'^+,K'^-) *are two solutions of (2), then* $Y=Y', Z=Z', V=V'$ *and* $K^+-K^-=K'^+-K'^-$.

Proof : Since there is a lack of integrability of the processes (Z,V,K^+,K^-) and (Z',V',K'^+,K'^-), we are proceeding by localization. Actually for $k\geq 1$ let us set:

$$\tau_k := \inf\{t\geq 0, \int_0^t (|Z_s|^2+|Z'_s|^2)ds+\int_0^t\int_E (|V_s(e)|^2+|V'_s(e)|^2)\lambda(de)ds\geq k\}\wedge T.$$

Then the sequence $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 0}$ is non-decreasing, of stationary type and converges to T since P-a.s., $\int_0^T(|Z_s(\omega)|^2+|Z'_s(\omega)|^2)ds+\int_0^T\int_E(|V_s(\omega,e)|^2+|V'_s(\omega,e)|^2)\lambda(de)ds<\infty$. Using now Itô's formula with $(Y-Y')^2$ on $[t\wedge\tau_k,\tau_k]$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(Y_{t\wedge\tau_k}-Y'_{t\wedge\tau_k})^2+\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|Z_s-Z'_s|^2ds+\sum_{t\wedge\tau_k<s\leq\tau_k}(\Delta(Y-Y')_s)^2\\
&=(Y_{\tau_k}-Y'_{\tau_k})^2+2\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}(Y_{s-}-Y'_{s-})(dK_s^+-dK_s^--dK_s'^++dK_s'^-)\\
&-2\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}(Y_s-Y'_s)(Z_s-Z'_s)dB_s-2\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}\int_E(Y_{s-}-Y'_{s-})(V_s(e)-V'_s(e))\widetilde{\mu}(ds,de).
\end{aligned}$$

But $(Y_{s-}-Y'_{s-})(dK_s^+-dK_s^--dK_s'^++dK_s'^-)\leq 0$, then taking expectation in the two hand-sides yields:

$$E[(Y_{t\wedge\tau_k}-Y'_{t\wedge\tau_k})^2+\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|Z_s-Z'_s|^2ds+\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}\int_E|V_s(e)-V'_s(e)|^2\lambda(de)ds]\leq E[(Y_{\tau_k}-Y'_{\tau_k})^2].$$

Using now Fatous's Lemma and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem w.r.t. k we obtain that $Y=Y', Z=Z', V=V'$ and $K^+-K^-=K'^+-K'^-$. □

Let us now recall the following result by S.Hamadène and Y.Ouknine [23] (see also [14]) related to BSDEs with one reflecting *rcll* barrier.

Theorem 2.1 *[23] : The BSDE with one reflecting rcll upper barrier associated with (f, ξ, U) has a unique solution, i.e., there exists a unique quadruple of processes $(Y_t, Z_t, V_t, K_t)_{t\leq T}$ such that:*

$$\begin{cases} (i)\ Y \in \mathcal{S}^2, Z \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d}, V \in \mathcal{L}^2 \text{ and } K \in \mathcal{A}^2 \\ (ii)\ Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s, V_s)ds - (K_T - K_t) - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E V_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de),\ \forall t \leq T, \\ (iii)\ \ Y_t \leq U_t,\ \forall t \leq T, \\ (iv)\ \text{if } K = K^c + K^d \text{ where } K^c \text{ (resp. } K^d\text{) is the continuous (resp. purely discontinuous) part} \\ \ \ \text{of } K \text{ then } K^d \text{ is predictable, } \int_0^T (U_t - Y_t)dK_t^c = 0 \text{ and } \Delta K_t = (Y_t - U_{t-})^+ 1_{[\Delta U_t > 0]}, t \leq T. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Moreover, the process Y can be characterized as follows: $\forall t \leq T$,

$$Y_t = essinf_{\tau \geq t} E[\int_t^\tau f(s, Y_s, Z_s, V_s)ds + U_\tau 1_{[\tau<T]} + \xi 1_{[\tau=T]} | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Remark 2.1 *(i) Rewriting equation (ii) forwardly we see that the predictable jumps of the process Y are positive and they are equal to the ones of K. The role of $K = K^c + K^d$ is to keep the process Y below U and it acts with a minimal energy. However the actions of K^c and K^d are complementary and not the same. Actually K^d does act only when the process Y has a predictable jump, which occurs at a predictable positive jump points of U. In that case the role of K^d is to make the necessary jump to Y in order to bring it below U. Therefore when Y has a predictable jump we compulsory have $U_- = Y_-$ and $\Delta Y_t = \Delta K_t^d = (Y_t - U_{t-})^+ 1_{[\Delta U_t > 0] \cap [Y_{t-} = U_{t-}]}$. Now the role of K^c is also to keep Y below the barrier but it does act only when Y reaches U either at its continuity or at its positive jump points. This is the meaning of $\int_0^T (U_t - Y_t)dK_t^c = 0$.*

(ii) The condition of point (iv) is equivalent to $\int_0^T (U_{s-} - Y_{s-})dK_s = 0$. Actually if (iv) is satisfied then $\int_0^T (U_{s-} - Y_{s-})dK_s = \int_0^T (U_{s-} - Y_{s-})dK_s^c + \int_0^T (U_{s-} - Y_{s-}) 1_{[\Delta Y_s < 0]} dK_s^d = 0$ because respectively the processes Y and U are rcll and the jumps of K are predictable and occur only when $U_{t-} = Y_{t-}$. Conversely if $\int_0^T (U_{s-} - Y_{s-})dK_s = 0$ then $\int_0^T (U_s - Y_s)dK_s^c = 0$ and $\int_0^T (U_{s-} - Y_{s-})dK_s^d = 0$. This latter implies $\Delta K_t^d = (Y_t - U_{t-})^+ 1_{[U_{t-} = Y_{t-}]} = (Y_t - U_{t-})^+ 1_{[U_{t-} = Y_{t-}] \cap [\Delta U_t > 0]} = (Y_t - U_{t-})^+ 1_{[\Delta U_t > 0]}$, whence the desired result.

(iii) The process K^d can also be written as: $\forall t \leq T$, $K_t^d = \sum_{0<s\leq t} (Y_t - U_{t-})^+ 1_{[\Delta U_t > 0]}$. □

Remark 2.2 *In Theorem 2.1, we have given the notion of a solution of a BSDE with one upper reflecting barrier. However one could have given the notion of a solution for a BSDE with a lower reflecting barrier. Actually a triple (Y, Z, V, K) is a solution for the BSDE with a lower reflecting rcll barrier L, a coefficient f and a terminal value ξ iff $(-Y, -Z, -V, K)$ is a solution for the BSDE with a reflecting upper rcll barrier associated with $(-f(t, \omega, -y, -z), -\xi, -L)$. The solution Y can also be characterized as a Snell envelope of the following form, i.e., the lowest rcll supermartingale of class $[D]$ (i.e. the set of random variables $\{Y_\tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_0\}$ is uniformly integrable) which dominates a given process: $\forall t \leq T$,*

$$Y_t = esssup_{\tau \geq t} E[\int_t^\tau f(s, Y_s, Z_s, V_s)ds + L_\tau 1_{[\tau<T]} + \xi 1_{[\tau=T]} | \mathcal{F}_t].$$ □

We will now provide a comparison result between solutions of one barrier reflected BSDEs which plays an important role in this paper. So assume there exists another quadruple of processes (Y', Z', V', K') solution for the one upper barrier reflected BSDE associated with (f', ξ', U). Then we have:

Theorem 2.2 *Assume that:*
(i) f is independent of v
(ii) P-a.s. for any $t \leq T$, $f(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) \leq f'(t, Y'_t, Z'_t, V'_t)$ and $\xi \leq \xi'$.
Then P-a.s., $\forall t \leq T$, $Y_t \leq Y'_t$. Additionally, if f' does not depend on v then we have also $K_t - K_s \leq K'_t - K'_s$, for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$.

Proof: The main idea is to make use of Meyer-Itô's formula with $\psi(x) = (x^+)^2$, $x \in R$, and $Y - Y'$ (see e.g. [34], pp. 221) which, after taking expectation in both hand-sides, yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[\psi(Y_t - Y'_t) + \int_t^T 1_{[Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-} > 0]} |Z_s - Z'_s|^2 ds \\
&\qquad + \sum_{t<s\leq T} \{\psi(Y_s - Y'_s) - \psi(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) - \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) \Delta(Y - Y')_s\}] \\
&\quad = E[\int_{]t,T]} \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) \{(f(s, Y_s, Z_s) - f'(s, Y'_s, Z'_s, V'_s)) ds - d(K_s - K'_s)] \\
&\quad \leq E[\int_{]t,T]} \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) \{(f(s, Y_s, Z_s) - f(s, Y'_s, Z'_s)) ds - d(K_s - K'_s)].
\end{aligned}$$

But for any $t \leq T$, $\int_{]t,T]} \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) d(K_s - K'_s) \geq 0$ since $\int_{]t,T]} \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) dK'_s = \int_{]t,T]} \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) \{dK'^c_s + dK'^d_s\} = 0$. Actually the first term is null since when K'^c increases then we compulsory have $Y' = U$ which implies that $\psi'(Y_{t-} - Y'_{t-}) = 0$ because $Y \leq U$. The second term is also null because when the purely discontinuous K'^d increases at t we should have $Y'_{t-} = U_{t-}$ and then once more $\psi'(Y_{t-} - Y'_{t-}) = 0$. Therefore for any $t \leq T$ we obtain:

$$E[\psi(Y_t - Y'_t) + \int_t^T 1_{[Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-} > 0]} |Z_s - Z'_s|^2 ds] \leq E[\int_t^T \psi'(Y_{s-} - Y'_{s-}) (f(s, Y_s, Z_s) - f(s, Y'_s, Z'_s)) ds].$$

Making use now of classical arguments to deduce that $\psi(Y_t - Y'_t) = 0$ for any $t \leq T$ and then $Y \leq Y'$.

Assume moreover now that f' does not depend on v. In that case the solutions of the BSDEs associated with (f, ξ, U) and (f', ξ', U') respectively can be constructed in using the following penalization schemes. Actually for $n \geq 0$ let (Y^n, Z^n, V^n) and (Y'^n, Z'^n, V'^n) defined as follows: $\forall t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&Y^n_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y^n_s, Z^n_s) ds - \int_t^T n(Y^n_s - U_s)^+ ds - \int_t^T Z^n_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E V^n_s(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de) \\
&\text{and} \\
&Y'^n_t = \xi' + \int_t^T f'(s, Y'^n_s, Z'^n_s) ds - \int_t^T n(Y'^n_s - U_s)^+ ds - \int_t^T Z'^n_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E V'^n_s(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de).
\end{aligned}$$

First not that through comparison we have $Y^n \leq Y'^n$ for any $n \geq 0$. On the other hand, it has been shown in ([14], Theorem 5.1) that the sequences $(Z^n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(V^n)_{n\geq 0}$ (resp. $(Z'^n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(V'^n)_{n\geq 0}$) converge in $L^p([0,T] \times \Omega, dt \otimes dP)$ and $L^p([0,T] \times \Omega \times U, dt \otimes dP \times d\lambda)$ to the processes Z and V (resp. Z' and V') for any $p \in [0, 2[$ (see also S.Peng [31] in the case of Brownian filtration). Moreover for

any stopping time τ the sequence $(Y_\tau^n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(Y_\tau'^n)_{n\geq 1}$ converge decreasingly to Y_τ and Y'_τ P-$a.s.$. Therefore, at least after extracting a subsequence, the sequences $\int_0^\tau (Y_s^n - U_s)^+ ds$ and $\int_0^\tau (Y_s'^n - U_s)^+ ds$ converge in $L^p(dP)$ to K_τ and K'_τ ($p \in [0,2[$). Henceforth for any $s \leq t$ we have:

$$K_t - K_s = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_s^t n(Y_s^n - U_s)^+ ds \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_s^t n(Y'^n_s - U_s)^+ ds = K'_t - K'_s$$

since $Y^n \leq Y'^n$. The proof is complete.□

Remark 2.3 *(i) Using Remark 2.1-(iii), since $Y \leq Y'$ then we obviously have $P-a.s.$, for any $s \leq t$, $K_t^d - K_s^d \leq K_t'^d - K_s'^d$.*
(ii) If the barriers are not the same, as it is assumed in the previous theorem, we can still get the comparison result of the $Y's$, but the comparison of the $K's$ could fail. □

Finally recall the following result related to indistinguishability of two optional or predictable processes which is used several times later. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the optional σ-field on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\leq T}, P)$, *i.e.*, the σ-field generated by the $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted *rcll* processes and X, X' two stochastic processes. Then we have:

Theorem 2.3 *([9], pp.220) Assume that for any stopping time (resp. predictable stopping time) τ we have P-a.s., $X_\tau = X'_\tau$ and the processes X and X' are $\mathcal{O}$-measurable ($\mathcal{P}^d$-measurable). Then the processes X and X' are undistinguishable.* □

3 Local solutions of BSDEs with two general *rcll* reflecting barriers

We are now going to show the existence of a process Y which satisfies locally the BSDE (2), *i.e.*, for any stopping time τ one can find another greater stopping time θ_τ such that on $[\tau, \theta_\tau]$, Y satisfies the BSDE (2) with terminal condition Y_{θ_τ}. The process Y will be constructed as the limit of solutions of a penalization scheme.

For BSDEs driven by a Brownian and Poisson measure, the comparison result between solutions does not hold in the general case, especially when the generators depend on v (see a counter-example in [3]). Therefore, we first assume that the map f does not depend on v, and for the sake of simplicity, we will assume that $f(t,\omega,y,z,v) \equiv g(t,\omega)$.

Let us now begin to analyze the increasing penalization scheme.

3.1 The increasing penalization scheme

Let us introduce the following increasing penalization scheme. For $n \geq 1$, let $(Y_t^n, Z_t^n, V_t^n, K_t^n)_{t\leq T}$ be the quadruple of processes with values in $R^{1+d} \times L^2(E, \mathcal{E}, \lambda; R) \times R$ such that:

$$\begin{cases} (i)\ Y^n \in \mathcal{S}^2, Z^n \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d}, V^n \in \mathcal{L}^2 \text{ and } K^n \in \mathcal{A}^2 \\ (ii)\ Y_t^n = \xi + \int_t^T \{g(s) + n(L_s - Y_s^n)^+\}ds - (K_T^n - K_t^n) - \int_t^T Z_s^n dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E V_s^n(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de) \\ (iii)\, Y^n \leq U \\ (iv) \text{ if } K^{n,c} \text{ (resp. } K^{n,d}) \text{ is the continuous (resp. purely discontinuous) part of } K^n, \text{ i.e.,} \\ K^n = K^{n,c} + K^{n,d}, \text{ then } \int_0^T (U_s - Y_s^n) dK_s^{n,c} = 0 \text{ and } K^{n,d} \text{ is predictable and satisfies} \\ K_t^{n,d} = \sum_{0<s\leq t} (Y_s^n - U_{s-})^+, \forall t \leq T. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

The existence of the quadruple $(Y^n, Z^n, V^n, K^{n,-})$ is due to Theorem 2.1. Now the comparison result given in Theorem 2.2 implies that for any $n \geq 0$ we have $Y^n \leq Y^{n+1} \leq U$ (this is the reason for which the scheme is termed as of increasing type). Therefore there exists a right lower semi-continuous process $Y = (Y_t)_{t\leq T}$ such that P-*a.s.*, for any $t \leq T$, $Y_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y_t^n$ and $Y_t \leq U_t$. Additionally and obviously the sequence of processes $(Y^n)_{n\geq 0}$ converges to Y in $\mathcal{H}^{2,1}$.

Next for an arbitrary stopping time τ, let us set:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\tau^n &:= \inf\{s \geq \tau, K_s^n - K_\tau^n > 0\} \wedge T \\ &= \inf\{s \geq \tau, K_s^{n,d} - K_\tau^{n,d} > 0\} \wedge \inf\{s \geq \tau, K_s^{n,c} - K_\tau^{n,c} > 0\} \wedge T. \end{aligned}$$

Once more from the comparison theorem (2.2), $K_t^n - K_\tau^n \leq K_t^{n+1} - K_\tau^{n+1}$, therefore $(\delta_\tau^n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a decreasing sequence of stopping times and converges to $\delta_\tau := \lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_\tau^n$, which is also a stopping time. Besides note that for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[$, $K_t^{n,d} - K_\tau^{n,d} = 0$ for any $n \geq 0$.

The processes Y satisfies:

Proposition 3.1 *: For any stopping time τ it holds true:*

$$P - a.s.,\ 1_{[\delta_\tau<T]} Y_{\delta_\tau} \geq 1_{[\delta_\tau<T]}(U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{[\delta_\tau>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau})^+).$$

Proof: By definition of δ_τ^n, $K_{\delta_\tau^n}^{n,c} = K_\tau^{n,c}$, hence from (5), we get that: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau^n]$,

$$Y_t^n = Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n + \int_t^{\delta_\tau^n} \{g(s) + n(L_s - Y_s^n)^+\}ds - (K_{\delta_\tau^n}^{n,d} - K_t^{n,d}) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau^n} Z_s^n dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau^n} \int_E V_s^n(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de). \tag{6}$$

In this equation the term $K_{\delta_\tau^n}^{n,d} - K_t^{n,d}$ still remains because the process $K^{n,d}$ could have a jump at δ_τ^n. Moreover we have:

$$\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau^n],\ K_{\delta_\tau^n}^{n,d} - K_t^{n,d} \leq 1_{[t<\delta_\tau^n]\cap[Y_{\delta_\tau^n-}^n = U_{\delta_\tau^n-}]}(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+ \tag{7}$$

since the stoping time δ_τ^n could be not predictable. Next for any $n \geq 0$, we have $Y^0 \leq Y^n \leq U$ then there exists a constant C such that $E[\sup_{t\leq T} |Y_t^n|^2] \leq C$. Additionally since f is Lipschitz then

standard calculations (see e.g. [23]) imply:

$$\sup_{n\geq 0} E[\int_\tau^{\delta_\tau^n} |Z_s^n|^2 ds] + \sup_{n\geq 0} E[\int_\tau^{\delta_\tau^n} ds \int_E |V_s^n(e)|^2 \lambda(de)] < \infty. \tag{8}$$

Then from (6) and (7) we deduce that:

$$Y_{\delta_\tau}^n 1_{[\delta_\tau<T]} \geq E[\{Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - 1_{[\delta_\tau<\delta_\tau^n]}(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+\}1_{[\delta_\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}] - E[\int_{\delta_\tau}^{\delta_\tau^n} |g(s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}] \tag{9}$$

because the random variable $1_{[\delta_\tau<T]}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}$.

But on the set $[\delta_\tau^n < T]$ it holds true that $Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n \geq U_{\delta_\tau^n} - 1_{[\delta_\tau^n>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+$. Actually thanks to Remark 2.1-(ii) on the set $[\delta_\tau^n > \tau] \cap [\delta_\tau^n < T]$ we have either $\{Y_{\delta_\tau^n-}^n = U_{\delta_\tau^n-}$ and $Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n > U_{\delta_\tau^n-}\}$ or $Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n = U_{\delta_\tau^n}$, hence $Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n \geq U_{\delta_\tau^n} \wedge U_{\delta_\tau^n-} = U_{\delta_\tau^n} - (\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+$. Now on $[\delta_\tau^n = \tau] \cap [\delta_\tau^n < T]$, once more thanks to 2.1-(ii), there exists a decreasing sequence of real numbers $(t_k^n)_{k\geq 0}$ converging to τ such that $Y_{t_k^n-}^n = U_{t_k^n-}$. Taking the limit as $k \to \infty$ gives $Y_\tau^n \geq U_\tau$ since U and Y^n are $rcll$, whence the claim.

Next going back to (9) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\delta_\tau}^n 1_{[\delta_\tau<T]} \quad &\geq E[\{(U_{\delta_\tau^n} - 1_{[\delta_\tau^n>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+)1_{[\delta_\tau^n<T]} - 1_{[\delta_\tau<\delta_\tau^n]}(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+\}1_{[\delta_\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}] \\ &\quad + E[\xi 1_{[\delta_\tau^n=T]\cap[\delta_\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}] - E[\int_{\delta_\tau}^{\delta_\tau^n} |g(s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We now examine the terms of the right-hand side (hereafter rhs for short) of (10). First note that in the space $L^1(dP)$, as $n \to \infty$, $E[\xi 1_{[\delta_\tau^n=T]\cap[\delta_\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\delta_\tau}] \to 0$ and from (8) we deduce also that $\int_{\delta_\tau}^{\delta_\tau^n} |g(s)|ds \to 0$ since $\delta_\tau^n \to \delta_\tau$. On the other hand let us set $A = \cap_{n\geq 0}[\delta_\tau < \delta_\tau^n]$. For n large enough we have:

$$1_{[\delta_\tau<\delta_\tau^n]}(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+ = 1_A(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+.$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} 1_{[\delta_\tau<\delta_\tau^n]}(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+ = \limsup_{n\to\infty} 1_A(Y_{\delta_\tau^n}^n - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+ \leq 1_A \limsup_{n\to\infty}(Y_{\delta_\tau^n} - U_{\delta_\tau^n-})^+ = 0.$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty}[U_{\delta_\tau^n} - 1_{[\delta_\tau^n>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+] &= U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_A \lim_{n\to\infty} 1_{[\delta_\tau^n>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+ - 1_{A^c} \lim_{n\to\infty} 1_{[\delta_\tau^n>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+ \\ &= U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{A^c} \lim_{n\to\infty} 1_{[\delta_\tau^n>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau^n})^+ = U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{A^c} 1_{[\delta_\tau>\tau]}(\Delta U_{\delta_\tau})^+ \\ &\geq U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{[\delta_\tau>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau})^+ \end{aligned}$$

and $1_{[\delta_\tau^n<T]\cap[\delta_\tau<T]} \to 1_{[\delta_\tau<T]}$ as $n \to \infty$. It follows that on $[\delta_\tau < T]$ we have, at least after extracting a subsequence and taking the limit,

$$Y_{\delta_\tau} \geq U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{[\delta_\tau>\tau]}(\triangle U_{\delta_\tau})^+.$$

The proof is now complete. □

Proposition 3.2 *:There exists a 4-uplet $(Z', V', K'^{+}, K'^{d,-})$ which in combination with the process Y satisfies:*

$$\begin{cases} (a)\, Z' \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d}, V' \in \mathcal{L}^2,\ K'^{+} \text{ and } K'^{d,-} \in \mathcal{A}^2; \\ (b)\, Y_t = Y_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds - (K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau} - K'^{d,-}_t) + (K'^{+}_{\delta_\tau} - K'^{+}_t) \\ \qquad\qquad - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} Z'_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau}\int_E V'_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de),\ \forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau] \\ (c)\, \forall t \in [0,T],\ L_t \le Y_t \le U_t \\ (d)\, K'^{+}_\tau = 0 \text{ and if } K'^{c,+} \text{ (resp. } K'^{d,+}) \text{ is the continuous (resp. purely discontinuous) part of } K'^{+} \\ \quad \text{then } K'^{d,+} \text{ is predictable, } K'^{d,+}_t = \sum_{\tau<s\le t}(L_{s-} - Y_s)^+,\ \forall t \in [\tau,\delta_\tau] \text{ and } \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau}(Y_s - L_s)dK'^{c,+}_s = 0 \\ (e)\, K'^{d,-} \text{ is predictable and purely discontinuous, } K'^{d,-}_\tau = 0,\ K'^{d,-}_t = 0\ \forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[, \text{ and if} \\ \quad K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau} > 0 \text{ then } Y_{\delta_\tau -} = U_{\delta_\tau -} \text{ and } K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau} = (Y_{\delta_\tau} - U_{\delta_\tau -})^+. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Proof: It will be divided into three steps.

Step 1: Construction of the process $K'^{d,-}$.

For $n \ge 0$ and $t \in [0,T]$ let us set $\Delta^{n,d}_t := K^{n,d}_{(t\vee\tau)\wedge\delta_\tau} - K^{n,d}_\tau$. The process $\Delta^{n,d}$ is purely discontinuous and predictable. We just focus on this latter property. Actually for any inaccessible stopping time ζ we have $\Delta^{n,d}_\zeta = 0$ since $K^{n,d}$ is predictable. On the other hand for any predictable stopping time η, $\Delta^{n,d}_\eta = 1_{[\tau<\eta]}K^{n,d}_\eta \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta-}$. Therefore $\Delta^{n,d}$ is predictable (see *e.g.* [4], pp.5, Prop.4.5). Now from Remark 2.3-(i) we get that for any $n \ge 0$, $\Delta^{n,d}_t \le \Delta^{n+1,d}_t, \forall t \le T$. On the other hand, $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[$, $\Delta^{n,d}_t = 0$, and finally for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$, $\Delta^{n,d}_t \le 1_{[t<\delta_\tau]\cap[Y^n_{\delta_\tau -} = U_{\delta_\tau -}]}(Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - U_{\delta_\tau -})^+$. It follows that $(\Delta^{n,d})_{n\ge0}$ converges to a non-decreasing purely discontinuous predictable *rcll* process $(K'^{d,-}_t)_{t\le T}$ which satisfies $K'^{d,-}_\tau = 0$ and for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[, K'^{d,-}_t = 0$. Suppose now that ω is such that $K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau}(\omega) > 0$ (which implies that we compulsory have $\tau(\omega) < \delta_\tau(\omega)$). Therefore there exists $n_0(\omega)$ such for any $n \ge n_0$ we have $\Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau}(\omega) > 0$. Using Remark 2.1-$(ii)$, it follows that for any $n \ge n_0$ we have $Y^n_{\delta_\tau -}(\omega) = U_{\delta_\tau -}(\omega)$ and $\Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau}(\omega) = (Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - U_{\delta_\tau -})^+(\omega)$. Consequently we have also $K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau}(\omega) = (Y_{\delta_\tau} - U_{\delta_\tau -})^+(\omega)$ and $Y_{\delta_\tau -}(\omega) = U_{\delta_\tau -}(\omega)$ since $Y^n \le Y \le U$ and then the left limit of $Y(\omega)$ at $\delta_\tau(\omega)$ exists. Thus we have established the claim (e). □

Step 2: Y is *rcll* on $[\tau, \delta_\tau]$ and $Y \ge L$.

¿From equation (6), since $\delta_\tau \le \delta^n_\tau$ then we have: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$,

$$Y^n_t = Y^n_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} n(L_s - Y^n_s)^+ds - (K^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau} - K^{n,d}_t) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} Z^n_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau}\int_E V^n_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de). \tag{12}$$

So if for $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$ we set $\bar{Y}^n_t = Y^n_t - \Delta^{n,d}_t = Y^n_t - (K^{n,d}_t - K^{n,d}_\tau) + \int_\tau^t g(s)ds$ then $\bar{Y}^n$ satisfies:

$$\bar{Y}^n_t = \bar{Y}^n_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} n(L_s - Y^n_s)^+ds - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} Z^n_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau}\int_E V^n_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de).$$

Write this latter forwardly, we get that on $[\tau, \delta_\tau]$, $\bar{Y}^n$ is a supermartingale for any n. Next it hods true that $P-a.s.$, $\forall\ t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$, $\bar{Y}^n_t \le \bar{Y}^{n+1}_t$.

Actually if $\tau = \delta_\tau$ then the claim is obvious since $\bar{Y}_t^n = Y_\tau^n$. Now if $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[\cap[\tau < \delta_\tau]$, the claim is also obvious since for any $n \geq 0$, $\bar{Y}_t^n = Y_t^n + \int_\tau^t g(s)ds$ and we know that $Y^n \leq Y^{n+1}$. Finally let us consider the case of $t = \delta_\tau(\omega)$ when $\tau(\omega) < \delta_\tau(\omega)$.

First note that $\bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^n = Y_{\delta_\tau}^n - (K_{\delta_\tau}^{n,d} - K_\tau^{n,d}) + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds$. So we are going to consider two cases.

Case 1: If $K_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1,d}(\omega) - K_\tau^{n+1,d}(\omega) = 0$ then thanks to comparison (see Remark 2.3-(i)) we have also $K_{\delta_\tau}^{n,d}(\omega) - K_\tau^{n,d}(\omega) = 0$, therefore $\bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^n(\omega) = Y_{\delta_\tau}^n(\omega) \leq Y_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1}(\omega) = \bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1}(\omega)$.

Case 2: If $K_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1,d}(\omega) - K_\tau^{n+1,d}(\omega) > 0$ then δ_τ is a stopping time such that the pair $(\omega, \delta_\tau(\omega))$ element of the graph of δ_τ, *i.e.* $[\![\delta_\tau]\!]$, does not belong to the graph $[\![\theta]\!] := \{(\omega, \theta(\omega)), \omega \in \Omega\}$ of any inaccessible stopping time θ. This is due to the fact that the process $K^{n+1,d}$ is predictable and its jumping times are exhausted by a countable set of disjunctive graphs of predictable stopping times (see *e.g.* [10], pp.128). Next as $K_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1,d}(\omega) - K_\tau^{n+1,d}(\omega) = (Y_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1} - U_{\delta_\tau -})^+ 1_{[Y_{\delta_\tau -}^{n+1} = U_{\delta_\tau -}]}(\omega)$ then $\bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1}(\omega) = Y_{\delta_\tau -}^{n+1}(\omega) + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g_s(\omega)ds = U_{\delta_\tau -}(\omega) + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g_s(\omega)ds$. So if $K_{\delta_\tau}^{n,d}(\omega) - K_\tau^{n,d}(\omega) > 0$ then it is equal to $(Y_{\delta_\tau}^n - U_{\delta_\tau -})^+ 1_{[Y_{\delta_\tau -}^n = U_{\delta_\tau -}]}(\omega)$ and $\bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^n = Y_{\delta_\tau -}^n + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds = U_{\delta_\tau -} + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds = \bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1}$. Now if $K_{\delta_\tau}^{n,d}(\omega) - K_\tau^{n,d}(\omega) = 0$ then $Y_{\delta_\tau}^n(\omega) = Y_{\delta_\tau -}^n(\omega)$ since $\delta_\tau(\omega)$ cannot be equal to $\theta(\omega)$ for any inaccessible stopping time θ, therefore $Y^n(\omega)$ is continuous at $\delta_\tau(\omega)$. It follows that $\bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^n(\omega) = Y_{\delta_\tau -}^n(\omega) + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g_s(\omega)ds \leq U_{\delta_\tau -}(\omega) + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g_s(\omega)ds = \bar{Y}_{\delta_\tau}^{n+1}(\omega)$. Thus the sequence $(\bar{Y}^n)$ is non-decreasing.

Now for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$, let us set $\bar{Y}_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} \nearrow \bar{Y}_t^n$. As $\bar{Y}^n$ is a supermartingale then $\bar{Y}$ is also a *rcll* supermartingale on $[\tau, \delta_\tau]$ (see e.g. [10], pp.86). But from the definition of $\bar{Y}^n$ we obtain that $\bar{Y}_t = Y_t - K_t'^d + \int_\tau^t g_s ds$ and since $K'^{d,-}$ is *rcll* then so is Y.

We now focus on the second property. We know that:

$$Y_\tau^n = Y_{\delta_\tau}^n + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} n(L_s - Y_s^n)^+ ds - (K_{\delta_\tau}^{n,d} - K_t^{n,d}) - \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} Z_s^n dB_s - \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} \int_E V_s^n(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de).$$

After taking expectation dividing by n and letting $n \to \infty$, we get $E[\int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} (L_s - Y_s^n)^+ ds] \to 0$ since the other terms in both hand-sides are bounded by Cn^{-1}. Therefore when $\tau(\omega) < \delta_\tau(\omega)$,$\forall t \in [\tau(\omega), \delta_\tau(\omega)[$, $Y_t(\omega) \geq L_t(\omega)$ since Y is *rcll* on $[\tau, \delta_\tau]$. Finally let us consider the case where $\tau(\omega) = \delta_\tau(\omega)$. ¿From the previous proposition we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]} Y_\tau &= 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\delta_\tau<T]} Y_{\delta_\tau} + 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\delta_\tau=T]} Y_T \\
&\geq 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\delta_\tau<T]} (U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{[\delta_\tau>\tau]} (\triangle U_{\delta_\tau})^+) + 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\delta_\tau=T]} \xi \\
&\geq 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\delta_\tau<T]} L_{\delta_\tau} + 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\delta_\tau=T]} L_T \\
&= 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]} L_\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$, $Y_t \geq L_t$. Actually we cannot have $P[L_{\delta_\tau} > Y_{\delta_\tau}] > 0$ because if so we obtain a contradiction in making the same reasoning after replacing τ by δ_τ. Henceforth for any stopping time τ we have $Y_\tau \geq L_\tau$ then, since Y and L are optional processes, from Theorem 2.3 we conclude that $P - a.s., \forall t \leq T$, $Y_t \geq L_t$.□

Step 3: Y satisfies equation (11).

For $n \geq 0$, let us introduce the process $\tilde{Y}^n$ defined by:

$$\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau], \tilde{Y}^n_t = Y^n_t - \Delta^{n,d}_t = Y^n_t - (K^{n,d}_t - K^{n,d}_\tau)$$

First note that for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[$, $K^{n,d}_t - K^{n,d}_\tau = 0$. Therefore making the substitution in (12) we obtain: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$,

$\tilde{Y}^n_t = Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - \Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} n(\tilde{L}^n_s - \tilde{Y}^n_s)^+ ds - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} (Z^n_s dB_s + \int_E V^n_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de))$,

where $\tilde{L}^n_t := L_t - \Delta^{n,d}_t$. On the other hand, it holds true that: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau], \tilde{Y}^n \geq \tilde{Y}^n \wedge \tilde{L}^n$ and $\int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} (\tilde{Y}^n_s - \tilde{Y}^n_s \wedge \tilde{L}^n_s) dK^n_s = 0$, where $K^n_t = \int_\tau^t n(\tilde{L}_s - \tilde{Y}^n_s)^+ ds$. Henceforth thanks to Remark 2.2, we have: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Y}^n_t &= \text{esssup}_{\, t \leq \sigma \leq \delta_\tau} E[1_{[\sigma = \delta_\tau]}(Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - \Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau}) + 1_{[\sigma < \delta_\tau]}(\tilde{L}^n_\sigma \wedge \tilde{Y}^n_\sigma) + \textstyle\int_t^\sigma g(s)ds | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \text{esssup}_{\, t \leq \sigma \leq \delta_\tau} E[1_{[\sigma = \delta_\tau]}(Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - \Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau}) + 1_{[\sigma < \delta_\tau]}(L_\sigma \wedge Y^n_\sigma) + \textstyle\int_t^\sigma g(s)ds | \mathcal{F}_t].\end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the following BSDE: $\forall t \in [0, \delta_\tau]$,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{S}^2, \tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d}, \tilde{V} \in \mathcal{L}^2 \text{ and } \tilde{K}^+ \in \mathcal{A}^2; \\ \tilde{Y}_t = Y_{\delta_\tau} - K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + (\tilde{K}^+_{\delta_\tau} - \tilde{K}^+_t) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} \tilde{Z}_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} \int_E \tilde{V}_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de), \\ \tilde{Y}_t \geq L_t - K'^{d,-}_t := \tilde{L}_t, \text{ and } \tilde{K}^+_t = \tilde{K}^{c,+}_t + \tilde{K}^{d,+}_t \text{ satisfies:} \\ \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} (\tilde{Y}_s - \tilde{L}_s) d\tilde{K}^{c,+}_s = 0, \ \tilde{K}^{d,+} \text{ is predictable and } \tilde{K}^{d,+}_t = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} (\tilde{L}_{s-} - \tilde{Y}_s)^+, \ \forall t \in [0, \delta_\tau]. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

The existence of the solution $(\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Z}_t, \tilde{V}_t, \tilde{K}_t)_{t \leq \delta_\tau}$ is guaranteed by Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.2. Additionally we have the following characterization for $\tilde{Y}$: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$,

$$\tilde{Y}_t = \text{esssup}_{\, t \leq \sigma \leq \delta_\tau} E[1_{[\sigma = \delta_\tau]}(Y_{\delta_\tau} - K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau}) + 1_{[\sigma < \delta_\tau]} L_\sigma + \int_t^\sigma g(s)ds | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

We are going now to prove that $P - a.s.$ for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$, $\tilde{Y}^n_t \nearrow \tilde{Y}_t$. Actually, $P - a.s.$, for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$ we have:

$$1_{[\tau \leq t < \delta_\tau]} L_t \wedge Y^n_t + 1_{[t = \delta_\tau]}(Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - \Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau}) \nearrow 1_{[\tau \leq t < \delta_\tau]} L_t + \wedge 1_{[t = \delta_\tau]}(Y_{\delta_\tau} - K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau}).$$

Note that the increasing convergence of $(Y^n_{\delta_\tau} - \Delta^{n,d}_{\delta_\tau})$ to $Y_{\delta_\tau} - K'^d_{\delta_\tau}$ is obtained from *Step 2*. Using now Lemma 5.1 given in Appendix we obtain that $\tilde{Y}^n \nearrow \tilde{Y}$, *i.e.*, for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$, $Y^n_t - \Delta^{n,d}_t \nearrow \tilde{Y}_t$. Therefore for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau], Y_t = \tilde{Y}_t + K'^{d,-}_t$. Taking now into account the equation satisfied by $\tilde{Y}$ we obtain: $\forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t = Y_{\delta_\tau} - (K'^{d,-}_{\delta_\tau} - K'^{d,-}_t) + \textstyle\int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + (\tilde{K}^{c,+}_{\delta_\tau} - \tilde{K}^{c,+}_t) + (\tilde{K}^{d,+}_{\delta_\tau} - \tilde{K}^{d,+}_t) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} \tilde{Z}_s dB_s \\ - \textstyle\int_t^{\delta_\tau} \int_E \tilde{V}_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Next let us set $K'^{c,+}_t = (\tilde{K}^{c,+}_{(t \vee \tau) \wedge \delta_\tau} - \tilde{K}^{c,+}_\tau)$, $t \leq T$ (and then $K'^{c,+}_\tau = 0$). Then the process $K'^{c,+}$ is non-decreasing continuous and satisfies $\int_\tau^{\delta_\tau} (Y_s - L_s) dK'^{c,+}_s = 0$ since $Y_t - L_t = \tilde{Y}_t - \tilde{L}_t$ for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau]$.

Next we set $K_t'^{d,+} = (\tilde{K}^{d,+}_{(t\vee\tau)\wedge\delta_\tau} - \tilde{K}^{d,+}_\tau)$, $t \le T$ (and then $K_\tau'^{d,+} = 0$). Then $K'^{d,+}$ is non-decreasing predictable and purely discontinuous since $\tilde{K}^{d,+}$ is so. Finally for $t \le T$ let us set $Z'_t = \tilde{Z}_t 1_{[\tau,\delta_\tau]}(t)$ and $V'_t = \tilde{V}_t 1_{[\tau,\delta_\tau]}(t)$. Therefore using equation (14) we obtain that the 5-uple $(Y, Z', V', K'^{c,+}, K'^{d,+}, K'^{d,-})$ satisfies (b). It remains now to show property (d).

Let η be a predictable stopping time such that $\eta < \delta_\tau$ and $\Delta K_\eta'^{d,+} > 0$. Therefore $\Delta K_\eta'^{d,+} = \Delta\tilde{K}_\eta^{d,+} = (\tilde{L}_{\eta-} - \tilde{Y}_\eta)^+ = (L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta)^+$ since $K_t'^{d,-} = 0$ for any $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[$. Suppose now that $\eta = \delta_\tau$ and $\Delta K_\eta'^{d,+} > 0$. Therefore thanks to (14) we have $0 < \Delta K_\eta'^{d,+} = \Delta\tilde{K}_\eta^{d,+} = Y_{\eta-} - Y_\eta + K_\eta'^{d,-} = \tilde{Y}_{\eta-} - Y_\eta + K_\eta'^{d,-} = L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta + K_\eta'^{d,-}$. Recall here that the Poisson part in (14) have only inaccessible jumps and η is predictable. But if $K_\eta'^{d,-} > 0$ then $Y_{\eta-} = U_{\eta-}$ and $K_\eta'^{d,-} = Y_\eta - U_{\eta-}$, then $0 < \Delta K_\eta'^{d,+} = \Delta\tilde{K}_\eta^{d,+} = L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta + Y_\eta - U_{\eta-} \le 0$ which is contradictory. It follows that $K_\eta'^{d,-} = 0$ and then $\Delta K_\eta'^{d,+} = L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta = (L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta)^+$. The proof is now complete. □

3.2 Analysis of the decreasing penalization scheme

We now consider the following decreasing penalization scheme:

$$\begin{cases} (i)\ Y'^n \in \mathcal{S}^2,\ Z'^n \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d},\ V'^n \in \mathcal{L}^2,\ K'^n \in \mathcal{A}^2 \\ (ii)\ Y_t'^n = \xi + \displaystyle\int_t^T \{g(s) - n(Y_s'^n - U_s)^+\}ds + (K_T'^n - K_t'^n) \\ \qquad\qquad - \displaystyle\int_t^T Z_s'^n dB_s - \int_t^T\int_E V_s'^n(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de),\ \forall t \in [0,T] \\ (iii)\, Y^n \ge L \\ (iv)\ \text{if } K'^{n,c} \text{ (resp. } K'^{n,d}\text{) is the continuous (resp. purely discontinuous) part of } K'^n, \textit{i.e.}, \\ K'^n = K'^{n,c} + K'^{n,d}, \text{ then } \int_0^T (Y_s'^n - L_{s-})dK_s'^{n,c} = 0 \text{ and } K'^{n,d} \text{ is predictable and satisfies} \\ K_t'^{n,d} = \sum_{0<s\le t}(L_{s-} - Y_s'^n)^+, \forall t \le T. \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

For any $n \ge 0$, the quadruple (Y'^n, Z'^n, V'^n, K'^n) exists through Theorem 2.1. Using once more the comparison result Theorem 2.2, we have for any $n \ge 0$ P-*a.s.*, $L \le Y'^{n+1} \le Y'^n$ therefore there exists a process $Y' := (Y'_t)_{t\le T}$ such that P-*a.s.*, $Y' \ge L$ and for any $t \le T$, $Y'_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y_t'^n$. Additionally thanks to the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem the sequence $(Y'^n)_{n\ge0}$ converges to Y' in $\mathcal{H}^{2,1}$. Next for any stopping time τ and $n \ge 0$, let us set:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\tau^n &:= \inf\{s \ge \tau, K_s'^n - K_\tau'^n > 0\} \wedge T \\ &= \inf\{s \ge \tau : K_s'^{n,d} - K_\tau'^{n,d} > 0\} \wedge \inf\{s \ge \tau, K_s'^{n,c} - K_\tau'^{n,c} > 0\} \wedge T. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The same analysis reveals that $(\lambda_\tau^n)_{n\ge0}$ is a non-decreasing sequence of stopping times and converges to another stopping time $\lambda_\tau := \lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_\tau^n$. The following properties related to Y', which are the analogous of the ones of Proposition 3.1 & 3.2, hold true:

Proposition 3.3 *: (i) P-a.s.,* $1_{[\lambda_\tau<T]}Y'_{\lambda_\tau} \le 1_{[\lambda_\tau<T]}(L_{\lambda_\tau} + 1_{[\lambda_\tau>\tau]}(\triangle L_{\lambda_\tau})^-)$.

(ii) There exists a 4-uplet of processes $(Z^{"}, V^{"}, K^{",-}, K^{"d,+})$ *which in association with* Y' *satisfies:*

$$\begin{cases} (a)\ (Z^{"}, V^{"}, K^{",-}, K^{"d,+}) \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d} \times \mathcal{L}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \\ (b)\ Y'_t = Y'_{\lambda_\tau} + \int_t^{\lambda_\tau} g(s)ds - (K^{",-}_{\lambda_\tau} - K^{",-}_t) + (K^{"d,+}_{\lambda_\tau} - K^{"d,+}_t) \\ \qquad\qquad - \int_t^{\lambda_\tau} Z^{"}_s dB_s - \int_t^{\lambda_\tau} \int_E V^{"}_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de),\ \forall t \in [\tau, \lambda_\tau] \\ (c)\ \forall t \in [0,T], L_t \le Y'_t \le U_t \\ (d)\ K^{",-}_\tau = 0 \text{ and if } K^{"c,-} \text{(resp. } K^{"d,-}\text{)is the continuous (resp. purely discontinuous) part of } K^{",-} \\ \quad \text{then } K^{"d,-} \text{ is predictable, } K^{"d,-}_t = \sum_{\tau<s\le t}(Y'_s - U_{s-})^+,\ \forall t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau] \text{ and } \int_\tau^{\lambda_\tau}(U_s - Y'_s)dK^{"c,-}_s = 0 \\ (e)\ K^{"d,+} \text{ is predictable and purely discontinuous, } K^{"d,+}_\tau = 0,\ K^{"d,+}_t = 0 \forall t \in [\tau, \lambda_\tau[, \text{ and if} \\ \quad K^{"d,+}_{\lambda_\tau} > 0 \text{ then } Y'_{\lambda_\tau -} = L_{\lambda_\tau -} \text{ and } K^{"d,+}_{\lambda_\tau} = (L_{\lambda_\tau -} - Y'_{\lambda_\tau})^+. \ \square \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Proof: Actually the proof is based on the results of Propositions 3.1 & 3.2. Indeed let $(\tilde{Y}^n, \tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{V}^n, \tilde{K}^{n,+})$ be the solution of the BSDE defined as in (5) but associated with $(-g(t), -\xi, -U, -L)$. Therefore uniqueness implies that $(\tilde{Y}^n, \tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{V}^n, \tilde{K}^{n,+}) = (-Y'^n, -Z'^n, -V'^n, K'^{n,+})$. Now the properties (i)-(ii) are a direct consequences of the ones proved in Proposition 3.1 & 3.2. $\square$

Remark 3.1 *: the process* Y' *is rcll on the interval* $[\tau, \lambda_\tau]$. $\square$

3.3 Existence of the local solution

Recall that Y (resp. Y') is the limit of the increasing (resp. decreasing) approximating scheme. Really the processes Y and Y' are undistinguishable as we show it now.

Proposition 3.4 *: P-a.s., for any* $t \le T$, $Y_t = Y'_t$. *Additionally* Y *is rcll.*

Proof: First let us point out that for any $n, m \ge 0$ and all $t \in [0,T]$ we have $Y^n_t \le Y'^m_t$. Actually to prove this claim, we just need to apply Meyer-Itô's formula as in Theorem 2.2 with $\psi(Y^n - Y'^m)$ where $\psi(x) = (x^+)^2 (x \in R)$ and to remark that:

$$\int_t^T \psi'(Y^n_s - Y'^m_s)m(Y'^m_s - U_s)^+ ds = \int_t^T \psi'(Y^n_s - Y'^m_s)n(L_s - Y^n_s)^+ ds = 0.$$

Then we argue as in Theorem 2.2 to obtain that for any $t \le T$ we have $Y^n_t \le Y'^m_t$. Therefore $P - a.s., \forall t \le T, Y_t \le Y'_t$.

Next let τ be a stopping time and μ^p_τ another stopping time defined by:

$$\mu^p_\tau := \inf\{s \ge \tau : Y_s \ge U_s - p^{-1} \text{ or } Y'_s \le L_s + p^{-1}\} \wedge T$$

where p is a real constant ≥ 1. First let us notice that for all $s \in [\tau, \mu^p_\tau] \cap [\tau < \mu^p_\tau]$ and all n we have:

$$Y^n_{s-} < U_{s-} \text{ and } Y'^n_{s-} > L_{s-}.$$

Therefore for any $s \in [\tau, \mu_\tau^p]$ we have $d(K_s^n + K_s'^n) = 0$. Now using Itô's formula with $(Y_t'^n - Y_t^n)^2 e^{2(C^2+C)t}$, $t \in [\tau, \mu_\tau^p]$, then taking expectation in both hand-sides yield ($C := C_f$):

$$E[(Y_\tau'^n - Y_\tau^n)^2] \leq e^{2(C^2+C)T} E[(Y_{\mu_\tau^p}'^n - Y_{\mu_\tau^p}^n)^2] \tag{18}$$

and finally taking the limit as $n \to \infty$ to obtain:

$$E[(Y_\tau' - Y_\tau)^2] \leq e^{2(C^2+C)T} E[(Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p})^2].$$

Here note that we are not allowed to apply Itô formula with $Y - Y'$ because we do not know whether $Y - Y'$ is a semimartingale on $[\tau, \mu_\tau^p]$. Next let us show that $E[(Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p})^2] \to 0$ as $p \to \infty$. First notice that $0 \leq (Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p}) 1_{[\tau < \mu_\tau^p]} \leq \frac{1}{p}$ since $U \geq Y' \geq Y \geq L$. Let us now focus on the case when $\tau = \mu_\tau^p$. First we have:

$$1_{[\tau=\mu_\tau^p]}(Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p}) = 1_{[\tau=\mu_\tau^p]\cap[\tau<\delta_\tau\wedge\lambda_\tau]}(Y_\tau' - Y_\tau) + 1_{[\tau=\mu_\tau^p]\cap[\tau=\delta_\tau\wedge\lambda_\tau]}(Y_\tau' - Y_\tau). \tag{19}$$

Suppose that $\omega \in [\tau = \mu_\tau^p] \cap [\tau < \delta_\tau \wedge \lambda_\tau]$. Then there exists a sequence of real numbers $(t_k)_{k\geq 0}$ which depends on p and ω such that $t_k \searrow \tau$ as $k \to \infty$ and $Y_{t_k} \geq U_{t_k} - \frac{1}{p}$ or $Y_{t_k}' \leq L_{t_k} + \frac{1}{p}$. So assume we have $Y_{t_k} \geq U_{t_k} - \frac{1}{p}$. Then taking the limit as $k \to \infty$ implies that $Y_\tau \geq U_\tau - \frac{1}{p}$ since $\omega \in [\tau < \delta_\tau]$ and we know that Y is $rcll$ on $[\tau, \delta_\tau]$. It follows that $U_\tau \geq Y_\tau' \geq Y_\tau \geq U_\tau - \frac{1}{p}$. In the same way we can show that if $Y_{t_k}' \leq L_{t_k} + \frac{1}{p}$ then $L_\tau \leq Y_\tau \leq Y_\tau' \leq L_\tau + \frac{1}{p}$. Therefore $1_{[\tau=\mu_\tau^p]\cap[\tau<\delta_\tau\wedge\lambda_\tau]}(Y_\tau' - Y_\tau) \leq \frac{1}{p}$. Finally let us deal with the second term of (19). We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau\wedge\lambda_\tau]}(Y_\tau' - Y_\tau) &= 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau\wedge\lambda_\tau]\cap[\tau<T]}(Y_\tau' - Y_\tau) \\
&= 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\tau<T]\cap[\delta_\tau\leq\lambda_\tau]}(Y_{\delta_\tau}' - Y_{\delta_\tau}) + 1_{[\tau=\lambda_\tau]\cap[\tau<T]\cap[\lambda_\tau<\delta_\tau]}(Y_{\lambda_\tau}' - Y_{\lambda_\tau}) \\
&= 1_{[\tau=\delta_\tau]\cap[\tau<T]\cap[\delta_\tau\leq\lambda_\tau]}(Y_{\delta_\tau}' - U_{\delta_\tau}) + 1_{[\tau=\lambda_\tau]\cap[\tau<T]\cap[\lambda_\tau<\delta_\tau]}(L_{\lambda_\tau} - Y_{\lambda_\tau}) \\
&\leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

because in that case, taking into account of 3.1 & 3.3-(i), we have either $Y_{\delta_\tau} = U_{\delta_\tau}$ or $Y_{\lambda_\tau}' = L_{\lambda_\tau}$ and we know that $U \geq Y' \geq Y \geq L$.

It follows that $0 \leq (Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p})^2 = 1_{[\tau<\mu_\tau^p]}(Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p})^2 + 1_{[\tau=\mu_\tau^p]}(Y_{\mu_\tau^p}' - Y_{\mu_\tau^p})^2 \leq \frac{1}{p^2}$, then taking the limit as $p \to \infty$ in (18) we deduce that $Y_\tau = Y_\tau'$. As τ is an arbitrary stopping time then $P - a.s.$, $Y = Y'$.

We are now going to deal with the second property. For any $t \leq T$, we have: $U_t \geq Y_t \geq Y_t^n$ and $L_t \leq Y_t' \leq Y_t'^n$, hence from the right continuity of Y^n and Y'^n we have:

$$\liminf_{s\downarrow t} Y_s \geq \liminf_{s\downarrow t} Y_s^n = Y_t^n \text{ and } \limsup_{s\downarrow t} Y_s = \limsup_{s\downarrow t} Y_s' \leq \limsup_{s\downarrow t} Y_s'^n = Y_t'^n.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ we get the right continuity of Y since $Y = Y'$. Let us now show that Y has left limits. Define the predictable processes $\bar{Y}$ and $\tilde{Y}$ as following: $\bar{Y}_t = \liminf_{s\uparrow t} Y_s$ and $\tilde{Y}_t = \limsup_{s\uparrow t} Y_s$. Then, we

only need to prove that for any predictable stopping time τ, we have $\bar{Y}_\tau = \tilde{Y}_\tau$. Let $(s_k)_k$ be a sequence of stopping times which announce τ. Then we have:

$$\tilde{Y}_\tau = \limsup_{s_k \uparrow \tau} Y_{s_k} = \limsup_{s_k \uparrow \tau} Y'_{s_k} \leq \limsup_{s_k \uparrow \tau} Y'^n_{s_k} = \lim_{s_n \uparrow \tau} Y'^n_{s_k} = Y'^n_{\tau-} = Y'^n_\tau + (L_{\tau-} - Y'^n_\tau)^+.$$

Letting now $n \to \infty$, we obtain, $\tilde{Y}_\tau \leq Y_\tau + (L_{\tau-} - Y_\tau)^+$. Similarly, we can also get that $\bar{Y}_\tau \geq Y_\tau - (Y_\tau - U_{\tau-})^+$. Since we obviously have $L_{\tau-} \leq \bar{Y}_\tau \leq \tilde{Y}_\tau \leq U_{\tau-}$ then combining the three inequalities yields:

$$L_{\tau-} \vee (Y_\tau - (Y_\tau - U_{\tau-})^+) \leq \bar{Y}_\tau \leq \tilde{Y}_\tau \leq U_{\tau-} \wedge (Y_\tau + (L_{\tau-} - Y_\tau)^+)$$

Note that the right-hand and the left-hand sides are equal to $L_{\tau-}1_{[Y_\tau < L_{\tau-}]} + Y_\tau 1_{[L_{\tau-} \leq Y_\tau \leq U_{\tau-}]}$ $+ U_{\tau-}1_{[Y_\tau > U_{\tau-}]}$. Therefore for any predictable stopping time τ, $\tilde{Y}_\tau = \bar{Y}_\tau$, hence due to the predictable section theorem (Theorem 2.3), $\tilde{Y}$ and $\bar{Y}$ are undistinguishable. It follow that $\lim_{s \nearrow t} Y_s$ exists for any $t \leq T$ and then Y has left limits. □

Through Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and the previous one we have:

Corollary 3.1 *The process Y satisfies:*

$$Y_{\delta_\tau} \geq U_{\delta_\tau} - 1_{[\tau < \delta_\tau]}(\Delta U_{\delta_\tau})^+ \text{ on } [\delta_\tau < T] \text{ and } Y_{\lambda_\tau} \leq L_{\lambda_\tau} + 1_{[\tau < \lambda_\tau]}(\Delta L_{\lambda_\tau})^- \text{ on } [\lambda_\tau < T].\square$$

Summing up now the results obtained in Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, we have the following result related to the existence of local solutions for the BSDE (2).

Theorem 3.1 *: There exists a process $Y := (Y_t)_{t \in [0,T]}$ such that:*

(1) *Y is $\mathcal{P}$-measurable, rcll and satisfies : $Y_T = \xi$*

(2) *for any stopping time τ there exists a stopping time $\theta_\tau \geq \tau$, P-a.s., and a quadruple of processes $(Z^\tau, V^\tau, K^{\tau,+}, K^{\tau,-}) \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d} \times \mathcal{L}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2$ $(K^{\tau,\pm}_\tau = 0)$ such that:*

The process Y satisfies the following equation which we notice hereafter $\mathcal{BL}(\xi, g, L, U)$: P-a.s.,

$$\begin{cases} (i)\ Y_t = Y_{\theta_\tau} + \displaystyle\int_t^{\theta_\tau} g(s)ds + (K^{\tau,+}_{\theta_\tau} - K^{\tau,+}_t) - (K^{\tau,-}_{\theta_\tau} - K^{\tau,-}_t) - \int_t^{\theta_\tau} Z^\tau_s dB_s - \int_t^{\theta_\tau}\int_E V^\tau_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de), \\ \qquad \forall t \in [\tau, \theta_\tau] \\ (ii)\ P-a.s., \forall t \in [0,T],\ L_t \leq Y_t \leq U_t \\ (iii)\ \displaystyle\int_\tau^{\theta_\tau} (U_s - Y_s)dK^{\tau c,-}_s = \int_\tau^{\theta_\tau} (Y_s - L_s)dK^{\tau c,+}_s = 0, \text{ where } K^{\tau c,\pm} \text{ is the continuous part of } \\ \quad K^{\tau,\pm} \\ (iv)\ \text{the process } K^{\tau,+} \text{ and } K^{\tau,-} \text{ are predictable and } \forall t \in [\tau, \theta_\tau],\ K^{\tau d,+}_t = \sum_{\tau < s \leq t}(L_{s-} - Y_s)^+ \\ \qquad \text{and } K^{\tau d,-}_t = \sum_{\tau < s \leq t}(Y_s - U_{s-})^+, \text{ where } K^{\tau d,\pm} \text{ is the purely discontinuous part of } K^{\tau,\pm}. \end{cases}$$

Hereafter we say that Y is the solution of $\mathcal{BL}(g, \xi, L, U)$.

Proof: Let $Y := (Y_t)_{t\leq T}$ be the adapted process defined as the limit of the increasing (or decreasing) scheme. Obviously it is *rcll* and satisfies, $L \leq Y \leq U$ and $Y_T = \xi$, P-*a.s.*.

Let us now focus on (2). Let τ be a stopping time, let δ_τ be the stopping time defined in the previous section and finally let us set $\theta_\tau = \lambda_{\delta_\tau}$. Thanks to Proposition 3.3, there exists $(Z^{"\delta_\tau}, V^{"\delta_\tau}, K^{"\delta_\tau d,+}, K^{"\delta_\tau,-})$ (which we only denote $(Z^", V^", K^{"d,+}, K^{",-})$) such that:

$$\begin{cases} (a)\ (Z^", V^", K^{",-}, K^{"d,+}) \in \mathcal{H}^{2,d} \times \mathcal{L}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \\ (b)\ Y_t = Y_{\theta_\tau} + \int_t^{\theta_\tau} g(s)ds - (K^{",-}_{\theta_\tau} - K^{",-}_t) + (K^{"d,+}_{\theta_\tau} - K^{"d,+}_t) \\ \qquad\qquad - \int_t^{\theta_\tau} Z^"_s dB_s - \int_t^{\theta_\tau} \int_E V^"_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de),\ \forall t \in [\delta_\tau, \theta_\tau] \\ (c)\ K^{",-}_{\delta_\tau} = 0 \text{ and if } K^{"c,-} \text{ (resp. } K^{"d,-}) \text{ is the continuous (resp. purely discontinuous) part of } K^{",-} \\ \quad \text{then } K^{"d,-} \text{ is predictable, } K^{"d,-}_t = \sum_{\delta_\tau < s \leq t}(Y_s - U_{s-})^+,\ \forall t \in [\delta_\tau, \theta_\tau] \text{ and } \int_{\delta_\tau}^{\theta_\tau}(U_s - Y_s)dK^{"c,-}_s = 0 \\ (d)\ K^{"d,+} \text{ is predictable and purely discontinuous, } K^{"d,+}_{\delta_\tau} = 0, \quad K^{"d,+}_t = 0\, \forall t \in [\delta_\tau, \theta_\tau[, \text{ and if} \\ \quad K^{"d,+}_{\theta_\tau} > 0 \text{ then } Y_{\theta_\tau -} = L_{\theta_\tau -} \text{ and } K^{"d,+}_{\theta_\tau} = (L_{\theta_\tau -} - Y_{\theta_\tau})^+. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Now for any $t \leq T$, let us set:

(i) $Z^\tau_t := Z'_t 1_{[\tau \leq t \leq \delta_\tau]} + Z''_t 1_{[\delta_\tau < t \leq \theta_\tau]}$ and $V^\tau_t := V'_t 1_{[\tau \leq t \leq \delta_\tau]} + V''_t 1_{[\delta_\tau < t \leq \theta_\tau]}$

(ii) $K^{\tau c,+}_t := K^{'c,+}_{(t\wedge\delta_\tau)\vee\tau}$, $K^{\tau c,-}_t := K^{"c,-}_{(t\wedge\theta_\tau)\vee\delta_\tau}$, $K^{\tau d,+}_t := K^{'d,+}_{(t\wedge\delta_\tau)\vee\tau} + K^{"d,+}_{(t\wedge\theta_\tau)\vee\delta_\tau}$, $K^{\tau d,-}_t := K^{'d,-}_{(t\wedge\delta_\tau)\vee\tau} + K^{"d,-}_{(t\wedge\theta_\tau)\vee\delta_\tau}$ and finally $K^{\tau,+} = K^{\tau c,+} + K^{\tau d,+}$ and $K^{\tau,-} = K^{\tau c,-} + K^{\tau d,-}$.

The constructions of Z^τ and V^τ are the concatenations of Z' and Z'' (resp. V' and V''). The same happens for the construction of the processes $K^{\tau c,\pm}$ and $K^{\tau d,\pm}$.

The process Z^τ (resp. V^τ) belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{2,d}$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}^2$) and, through their definitions, the processes $K^{\tau d,\pm}$ are non-decreasing, purely discontinuous and predictable, $K^{\tau c,\pm}$ are non-decreasing, predictable and continuous, finally all of them belong to $\mathcal{A}^2$.

Next let us show that Y, Z^τ, V^τ and $K^{\tau,\pm}$ enjoy the relations of (2).

Let $t \in [\tau, \theta_\tau]$. First assume that $t \in [\delta_\tau, \theta_\tau]$. Then from (20) and the above definitions we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &Y_{\theta_\tau} + \int_t^{\theta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_t^{\theta_\tau} d(K^{\tau,+}_s - K^{\tau,-}_s) - \int_t^{\theta_\tau} Z^\tau_s dB_s - \int_t^{\theta_\tau}\int_E V^\tau_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &\quad = Y_{\theta_\tau} + \int_t^{\theta_\tau} g(s)ds - (K^{",-}_{\theta_\tau} - K^{",-}_t) + (K^{"d,+}_{\theta_\tau} - K^{"d,+}_t) \\ &\qquad - \int_t^{\theta_\tau} Z^"_s dB_s - \int_t^{\theta_\tau}\int_E V^"_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &\quad = Y_t. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Suppose now that $t \in [\tau, \delta_\tau[$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\theta_\tau} \quad &+ \int_t^{\theta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_t^{\theta_\tau} d(K^{\tau,+}_s - K^{\tau,-}_s) - \int_t^{\theta_\tau} Z^\tau_s dB_s - \int_t^{\theta_\tau}\int_E V^\tau_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &= Y_{\theta_\tau} + \int_{\delta_\tau}^{\theta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_{\delta_\tau}^{\theta_\tau} d(K^{\tau,+}_s - K^{\tau,-}_s) - \int_{\delta_\tau}^{\theta_\tau} Z^\tau_s dB_s - \int_{\delta_\tau}^{\theta_\tau}\int_E V^\tau_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &\qquad + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} d(K^{\tau,+}_s - K^{\tau,-}_s) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} Z^\tau_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau}\int_E V^\tau_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &= Y_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} d(K^{\tau,+}_s - K^{\tau,-}_s) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} Z^\tau_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau}\int_E V^\tau_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &= Y_{\delta_\tau} + \int_t^{\delta_\tau} g(s)ds + (K^{',+}_{\delta_\tau} - K^{',+}_t) - (K^{'d,-}_{\delta_\tau} - K^{'d,-}_t) - \int_t^{\delta_\tau} Z'_s dB_s - \int_t^{\delta_\tau}\int_E V'_s \tilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ &= Y_t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the processes $(Y, Z^\tau, V^\tau, K^{\tau,+}, K^{\tau,-})$ satisfy equation $(2.i)$.

Next from the definitions of $K^{\tau,+}$ and $K^{\tau,-}$, (20)-(c) and (11)-(d) we have:

$$\int_\tau^{\theta_\tau}(Y_s - L_s)dK_s^{\tau c,+} = \int_\tau^{\delta_\tau}(Y_s - L_s)dK_s^{'c,+} = 0 \text{ and } \int_\tau^{\theta_\tau}(U_s - Y_s)dK_s^{\tau c,-} = \int_{\delta_\tau}^{\theta_\tau}(U_s - Y_s)dK_s^{"\tau c,-} = 0.$$

Now let η be a predictable stopping time such that $\tau \leq \eta \leq \theta_\tau$. Therefore thanks to relation $(2.i)$ we have:

$$\Delta Y_\tau = \Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,-} - \Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,+}.$$

But $\{\Delta K^{\tau d,-} > 0\} \subset \{Y \geq U_-\}$ and $\{\Delta K^{\tau d,+} > 0\} \subset \{Y \leq L_-\}$. As $L_- \leq U_-$ then $\Delta K^{\tau d,-}$ and $\Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,+}$ cannot jump in the same time. Henceforth the positive (resp. negative) predictable jumps of Y are the same as the ones of $K^{\tau d,-}$ (resp. $K^{\tau d,+}$).

Assume now that $\Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,+} > 0$. Therefore the definitions of $K^{\tau d,+}$, $K^{'d,+}$ and $K^{"d,+}$ imply that:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,+} &= \Delta K_\eta^{'d,+}1_{[\tau<\eta\leq\delta_\tau]} + \Delta K_\eta^{"d,+}1_{[\eta=\theta_\tau]} \\ &= (L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta)^+ 1_{[\tau<\eta\leq\delta_\tau]} + 1_{[\eta=\theta_\tau]}(L_{\theta_\tau-} - Y_{\theta_\tau})^+ = (L_{\eta-} - Y_\eta)^+\end{aligned}$$

because from (20) we deduce that on the interval $]\delta_\tau, \theta_\tau[$ the process Y does no have any predictable negative jump. Similarly for any predictable stopping time η such that $\tau \leq \eta \leq \theta_\tau$ and $\Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,-} > 0$, $\Delta K_\eta^{\tau d,-} = (Y_\eta - U_{\eta-})$. Thus we have proved $(2.iv)$. □

Remark 3.2 *When the process Y is fixed, from Proposition 2.1 we deduce that the quadruple $(Z^\tau, V^\tau, K^{\tau,+}, K^{\tau,-})$ is unique on $[\tau, \theta_\tau]$.* □

We are now ready to show that BSDE (2) has a solution. We first focus on the case when the generator f does not depend on (y, z, v) and later we deal with the general case.

4 Existence of a global solution for the BSDE with two completely separated *rcll* barriers

Let us assume that the barriers L and U and their left limits are completely separated, *i.e.*, they satisfy the following assumption:

[H]: $P - a.s., \forall t \leq T$, $L_t < U_t$ and $L_{t-} < U_{t-}$.

Then we have:

Theorem 4.1 *: Under Assumption **[H]**, the BSDE associated with $(g(t), \xi, L, U)$ has a unique solution.*

Proof : Let Y be the *rcll* process defined in Theorem 3.1. Then for any $n \geq 1$, there exists a stopping time γ_n, defined recursively as $\gamma_0 = 0, \gamma_n = \theta_{\gamma_{n-1}}$, and a unique quadruple $(Z^n, V^n, K^{n,+}, K^{n,-})$ which belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{2,d} \times \mathcal{L}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2$ and which with the process Y satisfy $\mathcal{BL}(\xi, g, L, U)$ on $[\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n]$.

First let us show that for any $n \geq 1$, $P[(\gamma_{n-1} = \gamma_n) \cap (\gamma_n < T)] = 0$.

Actually let ω be such that $\gamma_{n-1}(\omega) = \gamma_n(\omega)$ and $\gamma_n(\omega) < T$. Then using the properties of Corollary 3.1, we have $Y_{\gamma_n}(\omega) = L_{\gamma_n}(\omega) = U_{\gamma_n}(\omega)$. As we know that P-$a.s.$, $L < U$ then $P[(\gamma_{n-1} = \gamma_n) \cap (\gamma_n < T)] = 0$.

We will now prove that the sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is of stationary type, *i.e.*, $P[\omega, \gamma_n(\omega) < T, \forall n \geq 1] = 0$. In other words for ω fixed there exists an integer rank $n_0(\omega)$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\omega)$ $\gamma_n(\omega) = \gamma_{n+1}(\omega) = T$. Indeed let us set $A = \cap_{n\geq 1}(\gamma_n < T)$ and let us show that $P(A) = 0$. Let $\omega \in A$ and let us set $\gamma(\omega) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n(\omega)$. Using once more the inequalities of Corollary 3.1, there exist two sequences $(t_n(\omega))_{n\geq 1}$ and $(t'_n(\omega))_{n\geq 1}$ such that for any $n \geq 1$, $t_n, t'_n \in [\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n]$, $Y_{t_n} \geq U_{t_n} \wedge U_{t_n-} = U_{t_n} - (\Delta U_{t_n})^+$ and $Y_{t'_n} \leq L_{t'_n} \vee L_{t'_n-} = L_{t'_n} + (\Delta L_{t'_n})^-$. Now as $(t_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(t'_n)_{n\geq 1}$ are not of stationary type since $\gamma_n(\omega) < \gamma_{n+1}(\omega)$ then taking the limit as $n \to \infty$ to obtain that $Y_{\gamma-}(\omega) \leq L_{\gamma-}(\omega) \leq U_{\gamma-}(\omega) \leq Y_{\gamma-}(\omega)$. It means that the previous inequalities are equalities and then $L_{\gamma-}(\omega) = U_{\gamma-}(\omega)$. But this is impossible since P-$a.s.$, $\forall\ t \leq T$, $L_{t-} < U_{t-}$. It follows that $(\gamma_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is of stationary type.

Next let us introduce the following processes $Z, V, K^{\pm}$: $P - a.s.$, for any $t \leq T$, one sets:

$$Z_t = Z_t^1 1_{[0,\gamma_1]}(t) + \sum_{n\geq 1} Z_t^{n+1} 1_{]\gamma_n,\gamma_{n+1}]}, V_t = V_t^1 1_{[0,\gamma_1]}(t) + \sum_{n\geq 1} V_t^{n+1} 1_{]\gamma_n,\gamma_{n+1}]}$$

$$K_t^{c,\pm} = \begin{cases} K_t^{1c,\pm} & \text{if } t \in [0, \gamma_1] \\ K_{\gamma_n}^{c,\pm} + K_t^{(n+1)c,\pm} & \text{if } t \in]\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}] \end{cases}$$

$$K_t^{d,\pm} = \begin{cases} K_t^{1d,\pm} & \text{if } t \in [0, \gamma_1] \\ K_{\gamma_n}^{d,\pm} + K_t^{(n+1)d,\pm} & \text{if } t \in]\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}]. \end{cases}$$

Then a concatenation procedure and the same analysis as the one in Theorem 5.1 in [19] imply that the 5-uplet $(Y, Z, V, K^{\pm})$ verify the BSDE and the uniqueness of the solution has been shown in Proposition 2.1.

Remark 4.1 *: The sequence of stopping times $(\gamma_k)_{k\geq 0}$ will be called associated with the solution $(Y, Z, V, K^{\pm})$. Also note that for any k, we have the following local integrability of the processes Z, V and $K^{\pm}$:*

$$E[\int_0^{\gamma_k} ds\{|Z_s|^2 + \int_E |V_s(e)|^2 \lambda(de)\} + (K_{\gamma_k}^+)^2 + (K_{\gamma_k}^-)^2] < \infty. \square$$

We are now going to investigate under which conditions Mokobodski's condition introduced in (3) is verified. Actually we will show that it is locally satisfied when **[H]** is fulfilled.

Proposition 4.1 *Under **[H]**, there exists a sequence $(\gamma_k)_{k\geq 0}$ of stopping times such that:*
(i) for any $k \geq 0, \gamma_k \leq \gamma_{k+1}$ and the sequence is of stationary type, i.e. $P[\gamma_k < T, \forall k \geq 0] = 0 (\gamma_0 = 0)$;
(ii) for any $k \geq 0$, there exists a pair (h^k, h'^k) of non-negative supermartingales which belong to $\mathcal{S}^2$ such that:

$$P - a.s., \forall t \leq \gamma_k, L_t \leq h_t^k - h_t'^k \leq U_t.$$

Proof : Let (Y, Z, V, K^+, K^-) be the solution of the RBSDE associated with $(0, \xi, L, U)$ which exists thanks to Theorem 4.1. Let $(\gamma_k)_{k\geq 0}$ be the sequence of stopping times associated with this solution (see Remark 4.1). By construction this sequence satisfies the claim (i). Let us focus on (ii). For $k \geq 1$ and $t \leq T$ one sets:

$$h^k_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = E[Y^+_{\gamma_k} + (K^+_{\gamma_k} - K^+_{t\wedge\gamma_k})|\mathcal{F}_{t\wedge\gamma_k}] \text{ and } h'^k_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = E[Y^-_{\gamma_k} + (K^-_{\gamma_k} - K^-_{t\wedge\gamma_k})|\mathcal{F}_{t\wedge\gamma_k}]$$

where $Y^+_{\gamma_k} = \max\{Y_{\gamma_k}, 0\}$ and $Y^-_{\gamma_k} = \max\{-Y_{\gamma_k}, 0\}$. Then h^k, h'^k are supermartingales of $\mathcal{S}^2$ which satisfy $L_t \leq h^k_t - h'^k_t \leq U_t$ for any $t \leq \gamma_k$ since $E[\int_0^{\gamma_k} ds\{|Z_s|^2 + \int_E |V_s(e)|^2\lambda(de)\} + (K^+_{\gamma_k})^2 + (K^-_{\gamma_k})^2] < \infty$. Thus we have the desired result. □

Next with the help of this result we will be able to prove that the BSDE (2) has a solution in the case when the function f depends also on y, *i.e.*, $f(t, \omega, y, z, v) = f(t, \omega, y)$. Actually we have:

Proposition 4.2 *Under **[H]**, the BSDE associated with $(f(t, y), \xi, L, U)$ has a unique solution.*

Proof : Uniqueness is already given in Proposition 2.1. The existence will be obtained via a fixed point argument. Actually, let us set $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{H}^{2,1}$ endowed with the norm

$$||Y||_\alpha = E[\int_0^T e^{\alpha s}|Y_s|^2 ds]^{\frac{1}{2}};\ \alpha > 0.$$

Let Φ be the map from $\mathcal{D}$ into itself defined by $\Phi(Y) = \tilde{Y}$ where $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{V}, \tilde{K}^\pm)$ is the solution of the reflected BSDE associated with $(\xi, f(t, Y_t), L, U)$. Let Y' be another element of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\Phi(Y') = \tilde{Y}'$. Note again that there is a lack of integrability for $(\tilde{Z}, \tilde{V})$ and $(\tilde{Z}', \tilde{V}')$, then we need to proceed by localisation. So let us introduce the following sequence of stopping times:

$$\forall k \geq 1,\ \tau_k := \inf\{t \geq 0; \int_0^t (|Z_s|^2 + |Z'_s|^2)ds + \int_0^t \int_E (|V_s(e)|^2 + |V'_s(e)|^2)\lambda(de)ds \geq k\} \wedge T.$$

As we discussed in Proposition 2.1, the sequence is non-decreasing, of stationary type and converges to T. Applying Itô's formula to $e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_s - \tilde{Y}'_s)^2$ on $[0, \tau_k]$, we will get: for any $t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{\alpha(t\wedge\tau_k)}(\tilde{Y}_{t\wedge\tau_k} - \tilde{Y}'_{t\wedge\tau_k})^2 + \alpha\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_s - \tilde{Y}'_s)^2 ds \\
&\leq (M_{\tau_k} - M_{t\wedge\tau_k}) + 2\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_{s-} - \tilde{Y}'_{s-})(d\tilde{K}^+_s - d\tilde{K}'^+_s) - 2\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_{s-} - \tilde{Y}'_{s-})(d\tilde{K}^-_s - d\tilde{K}'^-_s) \\
&+e^{\alpha\tau_k}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_k} - \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_k})^2 + 2\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_s - \tilde{Y}'_s)(f(s, Y_s) - f(s, Y'_s))ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $(M_{t\wedge\tau_k})_{t\leq T}$ is actually a martingale. But taking into account Remark 2.1-(ii), we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_{s-} - \tilde{Y}'_{s-})(d\tilde{K}^+_s - d\tilde{K}'^+_s) &= \int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_{s-} - S_{s-} + S_{s-} - \tilde{Y}'_{s-})(d\tilde{K}^+_s - d\tilde{K}'^+_s) \\
&= \int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(S_{s-} - \tilde{Y}'_{s-})d\tilde{K}^+_s - \int_{t\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k} e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_{s-} - S_{s-})d\tilde{K}'^+_s \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is stationary, we have that $e^{\alpha\tau_k}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_k} - \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_k})^2 \to 0$ when $k \to \infty$. Therefore taking expectation in both hand sides of (22), using the inequality $|a.b| \leq \epsilon^{-1}|a|^2 + \epsilon|b|^2$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $a, b \in R^p$, and passing to the limit as $k \to \infty$, we get:

$$(\alpha - \epsilon C_f)E[\int_t^T e^{\alpha s}(\tilde{Y}_s - \tilde{Y}'_s)^2 ds] \leq \frac{C_f}{\epsilon}E[\int_t^T e^{\alpha s}(Y_s - Y'_s)^2 ds].$$

Choose α and ϵ appropriately, we can make that Φ is a contraction on $\mathcal{D}$. Therefore it has a fixed point Y which belongs also to $\mathcal{S}^2$. Thus the proposition is proved. □

Additionally, we have also the following lemma related to local integrability of the processes Z, V and $K^{\pm}$.

Lemma 4.1 *Assume [H] and let (Y, Z, V, K^+, K^-) be the unique solution associated with $(f(t, y), \xi, L, U)$. Let $(\gamma_k)_{k\geq 0}$ be a sequence of stopping times which satisfies (i) and (ii) of Proposition 4.1. Then for any $k \geq 0$, we have:*

$$E[\int_0^{\gamma_k} ds\{|Z_s|^2 + \int_E |V_s(e)|^2 \lambda(de)\} + (K^+_{\gamma_k})^2 + (K^-_{\gamma_k})^2] < \infty.$$

Proof : Since the 5-uple (Y, Z, V, K^+, K^-) is the solution of the BSDE associated with $(f(t, y), \xi, L, U)$, then for any γ_k, we have:

$$Y_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = Y_{\gamma_k} + \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k} f(s, Y_s)ds + \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k} d(K^+_s - K^-_s) - \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k} Z_s dB_s - \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k}\int_E V_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de). \quad (23)$$

On the other hand, on $[0, \gamma_k]$, Mokobodzki's condition **[Mk]** is satisfied. Therefore the BSDE associated with $(f(t, y)1_{[t\leq\gamma_k]}, Y_{\gamma_k}, L_{t\wedge\gamma_k}, U_{t\wedge\gamma_k})$ has a solution (see e.g. [23]) which we denote $(Y^k, Z^k, V^k, K^{k,+}, K^{k,-})$. Then it holds true that for any $t \leq T$:

$$Y^k_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = Y_{\gamma_k} + \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k} f(s, Y^k_s)ds + \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k} d(K^{k,+}_s - K^{k,-}_s) - \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k} Z^k_s dB_s - \int_{t\wedge\gamma_k}^{\gamma_k}\int_E V^k_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds, de).$$

Moreover we have the following integrability property:

$$E[\int_0^{\gamma_k} ds\{|Z^k_s|^2 + \int_E |V^k_s(e)|^2 \lambda(de)\} + (K^{k,+}_{\gamma_k})^2 + (K^{k,-}_{\gamma_k})^2] < \infty. \quad (24)$$

But uniqueness of the solution of the BSDE (23) implies that:

$$Y_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = Y^k_{t\wedge\gamma_k}, Z_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = Z^k_{t\wedge\gamma_k}, V_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = V^k_{t\wedge\gamma_k}, K^+_{t\wedge\gamma_k} - K^-_{t\wedge\gamma_k} = K^{k,+}_{t\wedge\gamma_k} - K^{k,-}_{t\wedge\gamma_k}.$$

Therefore, the desired result follows from (24). □

We are now ready to establish the main result of this paper. The proof is basically the same as the one given in ([18], Theorem 4.2, Step 2) even if in this latter paper the obstacles have only inaccessible jumps, therefore it is omitted.

Theorem 4.2 *Under **[H]**, the BSDE (2) with jumps and two reflecting discontinuous barriers associated with (f, ξ, L, U) has a unique solution, i.e., there exits a unique 5-uple (Y, Z, V, K^+, K^-) which satisfies the BSDE (2).* $\square$

Remark 4.2 *Under $[H]$ we have also the uniqueness of the increasing processes. Actually if $(Y, Z, V, K^{\pm})$ and $(Y', Z', V', K'^{\pm})$ are two solutions of the BSDE associated with $(f(t, y, z, v), \xi, L, U)$ then we have also $K^+ = K'^+$ and $K^- = K'^-$ (see e.g. [18] for the proof of this claim).* $\square$

We now deal with an application of these types of BSDEs in zero-sum mixed game problems.

5 Application in zero-sum mixed differential-integral game problem

We are going now to study the link between mixed zero-sum stochastic differential game and the reflected BSDE studied in the previous section. First let us briefly describe the setting of the problem of zero-sum game we consider.

Let $x_0 \in R^d$ and let $x = (x_t)_{t \leq T}$ be the solution of the following standard differential equation:

$$x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(s, x_s) dB_s + \int_0^t \int_E \gamma(s, e, x_{s-}) \widetilde{\mu}(ds, de)$$

where the mapping σ: $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times R^d \mapsto \sigma(t, x) \in R^d$ and γ: $(t, e, x) \in [0, T] \times E \times R^d \mapsto \gamma(t, e, x) \in R^d$ satisfy the following assumptions:

(i): there exists a constant C_1 such that

$$\forall (t, x), tr(\sigma\sigma^*(t, x)) + \int_E \gamma(t, e, x)^2 \lambda(de) \leq C_1(1 + |x|^2);$$

(ii): there exists a constant C_2 such that

$$\forall (t, x), tr[(\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y))(\sigma^*(t, x) - \sigma^*(t, y))] + \int_E |\gamma(t, e, x) - \gamma(t, e, y)|^2 \lambda(de) \leq C_2 |x - y|^2;$$

(iii): $\forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times R^d$, the matrix $\sigma(t, x)$ is invertible and $\sigma^{-1}(t, x)$ is bounded.

According to Theorem 1.19 in [30], the process $(x_t)_{t \leq T}$ exists and is unique thanks to the assumptions (i)-(ii) on the functions σ and γ. $\square$

Let A $(resp.\ B)$ be a compact metric space and $\mathcal{U}$ $(resp.\ \mathcal{V})$ be the space of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable processes $u = (u_t)_{t \leq T}$ $(resp.\ v = (v_t)_{t \leq T})$ with values in A $(resp.\ B)$. Let f be a function from $[0, T] \times R^d \times A \times B$ into R^d which is $\mathcal{B}([0, T] \times R^d \times A \times B)$-measurable and which satisfies:

(3-a): $f(t, x, u, v)$ is bounded for any t, x, u and v;

(3-b): for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times R^d$, the mapping $(u, v) \mapsto f(t, x, u, v)$ is continuous .$\square$

Now for $(u, v) = (u_t, v_t)_{t \leq T} \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$, let $L^{u,v} := (L_t^{u,v})_{t \leq T}$ be the positive local martingale solution of:

$$dL_t^{u,v} = L_{t-}^{u,v} \{\sigma^{-1}(t, x_t) f(t, x_t, u_t, v_t) dB_t + \int_E \beta(t, e, x_{t-}, u_t, v_t) \widetilde{\mu}(dt, de)\} \text{ and } L_0^{u,v} = 1$$

where for any t, x, e, u, v we have $-1 < \beta(t,x,e,u,v)$ and $|\beta(t,x,e,u,v)| \leq c_0(1 \wedge |e|)$ where c_0 is a constant. Then the measure $P^{u,v}$ defined by:

$$\frac{dP^{u,v}}{dP}|_{\mathcal{F}_T} = L_T^{u,v}$$

is actually a probability ([5], Corollary 5.1, pp.244) equivalent to P. Moreover, under the new probability $P^{u,v}$, $\mu(dt,de)$ remains a random measure, whose compensator is
$\bar{\nu}(dt,de) = (1+\beta(t,e,x_{t-},u_t,v_t))\lambda(de)dt$, i.e. $\tilde{\mu}^{u,v}([0,t]\times A) := (\mu - \bar{\nu})([0,t]\times A)_{t\leq T}$ is a martingale for any $A \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfying $\lambda(A) < \infty$, and $B_t^{u,v} = B_t - \int_0^t \sigma^{-1}(s,x_s)f(s,x_s,u_s,v_s)ds$ is a Brownian motion and $(x_t)_{t\leq T}$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= x_0 + \int_0^t f(s,x_s,u_s,v_s)ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s,x_s)dB_s^{u,v} + \int_0^t\int_E \gamma(s,e,x_{s-})\tilde{\mu}^{u,v}(ds,de) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_E \gamma(s,e,x_{s-})\beta(s,e,x_{s-},u_s,v_s)\lambda(de)ds \end{aligned}$$

It means that $(x_t)_{t\leq T}$ is a weak solution for this stochastic differential equation and it stands for the evolution of a system when controlled.

As we know, in mixed game problems, on a system intervene two agents c_1 and c_2 who act with admissible controls u and v respectively which belong to $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ respectively. Moreover, they can make the decision to stop controlling at τ for c_1 and σ for c_2, where τ and σ are two stopping times. Therefore a strategy for c_1 (resp. c_2) is a pair (u,τ) (resp. (v,σ)) and the system is actually stopped at $\tau\wedge\sigma$. Meanwhile, the interventions of the agents will generate a payoff which is a cost for c_1 and a reward for c_2 whose expression is given by:

$$J(u,\tau;v,\sigma) = E^{u,v}[\int_0^{\tau\wedge\sigma} h(s,x_s,u_s,v_s)ds + U_\tau 1_{[\tau<\sigma]} + L_\sigma 1_{[\sigma<\tau<T]} + \xi 1_{[\tau=\sigma=T]}],$$

where:

(1): $h : [0,T]\times R^d \times A \times B \mapsto R^+$ is $\mathcal{P}\bigotimes\mathcal{B}(A\times B)$-measurable function which stands for the instantaneous payoff between the two agents. In addition, the mapping is continuous w.r.t. (u,v) and there exists a constant C_h such that for any (t,x,u,v), $|h(t,x,u,v)| \leq C_h(1+|x|)$;

(2): the stopping payoffs $U = (U_t)_{t\leq T}$ and $L = (L_t)_{t\leq T}$ are processes of $\mathcal{S}^2$ and satisfy assumption [H], *i.e.*, $L_t < U_t$ and $L_{t-} < U_{t-}$ $\forall\, t \leq T$;

(3): ξ is a $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable such that $E[\xi^2] < \infty$ and $L_T \leq \xi \leq U_T$.

Remark 5.1 *Here we assume that L and U are strictly separated in order to infer the existence of a global solution of a RBSDE associated with ξ, L, U and an appropriate generator which we will precise later.* □

In this zero-sum game problem we aim at showing that the value of the game exists, i.e., it holds true that:

$$essinf_{(u,\tau)}esssup_{(v,\sigma)}J(u,\tau;v,\sigma) = esssup_{(v,\sigma)}essinf_{(u,\tau)}J(u,\tau;v,\sigma). \tag{25}$$

In [16, 21], the authors deal the mixed zero-sum differential game when the process $(x_t)_{t\leq T}$ has no jump part, the information comes only from a Brownian motion and the stopping payoffs are continuous. Actually, using results on two barrier reflected BSDEs they proved that the zero-sum game has a value and a saddle-point also. The value is expressed by means of the solution of the BSDE with two reflecting barriers. In this work, and for our general setting, we will be just able to show that the value of the mixed zero-sum differential game exits. However we are not able to infer the existence of a saddle-point because, and this is the main reason for that, the payoff processes have predictable jumps.

So let us define the Hamilton function associated with this game problem as following:
$\forall (t,x,z,r,u,v) \in [0,T]\times R^d \times R^d \times L^2_R(E,d\lambda)\times A\times B$,

$$H(t,x,z,r,u,v) := z\sigma^{-1}(t,x)f(t,x,u,v) + h(t,x,u,v) + \int_E r(e)\beta(t,e,x,u,v)\lambda(de)$$

Next assume that Isaacs'condition, which plays an important role in zero-sum mixed game problems, is fulfilled, *i.e.*, for any $(t,x,z,r)\in[0,T]\times R^d\times R^d\times L^2_R(E,d\lambda)$,

$$[A]: \inf_{u\in A}\sup_{v\in B} H(t,x,z,r,u,v) = \sup_{v\in B}\inf_{u\in A} H(t,x,z,r,u,v).$$

Under [A], through the assumptions above and Benes' selection theorem, the following result holds true (see e.g. [11]).

Proposition 5.1 *There exist two measurable functions $u^*(t,x,z,r)$ and $v^*(t,x,z,r)$ from $[0,T]\times R^d\times R^d\times L^2_R(E,d\lambda)$ into A and B respectively, such that:*

(i) the pair $(u^*,v^*)(t,x,z,r)$ is a saddle-point for the function H, i.e., for any u,v we have:

$$H(t,x,z,r,u^*(t,x,z,r),v) \leq H(t,x,z,r,(u^*,v^*)(t,x,z,r)) \leq H(t,x,z,r,u,v^*(t,x,z,r)).$$

(ii) the function $(z,r)\mapsto H(t,x,z,r,(u^*,v^*)(t,x,z,r))$ is uniformly Lipschitz.

Now let us set $H^*(t,x_t(\omega),z,r) = H(t,x_t(\omega),z,r,(u^*,v^*)(t,x_t(\omega),z,r))$ and let $(Y_t,Z_t,R_t,K^{\pm}_t)$ be the global solution associated with (H^*,ξ,L,U), which exists according to Theorem 4.2. Therefore we have: $\forall t\in[0,T]$,

$$\begin{cases} (i) Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T H^*(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s)ds + (K^+_T - K^+_t) - (K^-_T - K^-_t) - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s - \int_t^T\int_E R_s(e)\widetilde{\mu}(ds,de) \\ (ii)\ L_t \leq Y_t \leq U_t,\ \int_0^T (U_s - Y_s)dK^{c,-}_s = \int_0^T (Y_s - L_s)dK^{c,+}_s = 0 \text{ where } K^{c,\pm} \text{ is the} \\ \qquad \text{continuous part of } K^{\pm}\ (K^{c,+}_0 = 0); \\ (iii)\ K^{d,\pm},\ \text{the purely discontinuous part of } K^{\pm} \text{ is predictable and verifies} \\ \qquad\qquad K^{d,+}_t = \sum_{0<s\leq t}(L_{s-} - Y_s)^+ \text{ and } K^{d,-}_t = \sum_{0<s\leq t}(Y_s - U_{s-})^+; \\ (iv) \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds + \int_0^T\int_E |R_s(e)|^2\lambda(de)ds < \infty, P-a.s. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

The following is the main result of this part:

Theorem 5.1 *We have:*

$$Y_0 = esssup_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_0, v\in\mathcal{V}} essinf_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_0, u\in\mathcal{U}} J(u,\tau;v,\sigma) = essinf_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_0, u\in\mathcal{U}} esssup_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_0, v\in\mathcal{V}} J(u,\tau;v,\sigma)$$

i.e. Y_0 *is the value of the zero-sum mixed differential game.*

Proof: First note that Y_0 is a constant since $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains only the P-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$. Now, for any fixed $(u,v)\in\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{V}$, let $(Y^{u,v},\bar{Z},\bar{R},\bar{K}^{\pm})$ be the solution of the following reflected BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} (i)\ Y_t^{u,v} = \xi + \int_t^T H(s,x_s,\bar{Z}_s,\bar{R}_s,u_s,v_s)ds + (\bar{K}_T^+ - \bar{K}_t^+) - (\bar{K}_T^- - \bar{K}_t^-) \\ \qquad\qquad - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s dB_s - \int_t^T\int_E \bar{R}_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de); \\ (ii)\ L_t \le Y_t^{u,v} \le U_t \text{ and } \int_0^T (U_s - Y_s^{u,v})d\bar{K}_s^{c,-} = \int_0^T (Y_s^{u,v} - L_s)d\bar{K}_s^{c,+} = 0 \text{ where } \bar{K}^{c,\pm} \\ \qquad \text{is the continuous part of } \bar{K}^{\pm}\ (\bar{K}_0^{c,+} = 0); \\ (iii)\ \bar{K}_t^{d,+} = \sum_{0<s\le t}(L_{s-} - Y_s^{u,v})^+ \text{ and } \bar{K}_t^{d,-} = \sum_{0<s\le t}(Y_s^{u,v} - U_{s-})^+; \\ (iv)\ \int_0^T |\bar{Z}_s|^2 ds + \int_0^T\int_E |\bar{R}_s(e)|^2\lambda(de)ds < \infty, P-a.s. \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

Even in our setting where there are general jumps in the equation, making a change of probability and arguing as in [32], we obtain that $Y_t^{u,v}$ is the value function of the Dynkin game, *i.e.*,

$$Y_t^{u,v} = \text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_t} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma) = \text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_t} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma),$$

where

$$J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma) = E^{u,v}[\int_t^{\tau\wedge\sigma} h(s,x_s,u_s,v_s)ds + U_\tau 1_{[\tau<\sigma]} + L_\sigma 1_{[\sigma\le\tau<T]} + \xi 1_{[\tau=\sigma=T]}|\mathcal{F}_t]. \tag{28}$$

Let us now prove that:

$$Y_t = \text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v} = \text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}}\text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Y_t^{u,v}. \tag{29}$$

However since $\text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v} \le \text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}}\text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Y_t^{u,v}$, we just need to prove that:

$$\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}}\text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Y_t^{u,v} \le Y_t \le \text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v}$$

where Y_t is the solution of (26).

First note that the processes $(u_t^* = u^*(t,x_t,Z_t,R_t))_{t\le T}$ and $(v_t^* = v^*(t,x_t,Z_t,R_t))_{t\le T}$ are admissible controls. Now let $(u_t)_{t\le T}$ be an arbitrary admissible control. The generator $H(t,x_t,z,r,u_t,v^*(t,x_t,Z_t,R_t))$ is uniformly Lipschitz *w.r.t.* (z,r). Therefore thanks to Theorem 4.2 there exists a process Y^{u,v^*} such that for any $t\le T$:

$$Y_t^{u,v*} = \xi + \int_t^T H(s,\tilde{Z}_s,\tilde{R}_s,u_s,v_s^*)ds + (\tilde{K}_T^+ - \tilde{K}_t^+) - (\tilde{K}_T^- - \tilde{K}_t^-) - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s dB_s - \int_t^T\int_E \tilde{R}_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de).$$

Let us define a new probability P^{u,v^*} by

$$\frac{dP^{u,v^*}}{dP}|_{\mathcal{F}_T} = L_T^{u,v^*}.$$

Using Itô-Meyer's formula ([34], pp.221) for $(Y - Y^{u,v^*})^{+2}$ and taking into account that:

$$\begin{aligned} H^*(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s) \quad & -H(s,x_s,\tilde{Z}_s,\tilde{R}_s,u_s,v_s^*) = H^*(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s) - H(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s,u_s,v_s^*) \\ & \qquad +H(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s,u_s,v_s^*) - H(s,x_s,\tilde{Z}_s,\tilde{R}_s,u_s,v_s^*) \\ & = H^*(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s) - H(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s,u_s,v_s^*) + (Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s)\sigma^{-1}(s,X_s)f(s,X_s,u_s,v_s^*) \\ & \qquad + \int_E (R_{s-}(e) - \tilde{R}_{s-}(e))\beta(s,e,X_s,u_s,v_s^*)\lambda(de), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain: $\forall t \in [0,T]$:

$$\begin{aligned} (Y_t - Y_t^{u,v^*})^{+2} \quad & \leq 2\int_t^T (Y_s - Y_s^{u,v^*})^+ (H^*(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s) - H(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s,u_s,v_s^*))ds \\ & +2\int_t^T (Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s)dB_s^{u,v^*} + 2\int_t^T \int_E (R_s(e) - \tilde{R}_s(e))\tilde{\mu}^{u,v^*}(ds,de), \end{aligned}$$

where under the new probability P^{u,v^*}, the process B^{u,v^*} is a Brownian motion and $\mu^{u,v^*}(ds,de)$ is a martingale measure. Now since $H^*(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s) - H(s,x_s,Z_s,R_s,u_s,v_s^*) \leq 0$, after localization, taking expectation under P^{u,v^*} and then the limit, we obtain $P^{u,v^*} - a.s.$, $Y_t \leq Y_t^{u,v^*}$. Therefore $P - a.s.$ for any $t \leq T$, $Y_t \leq Y_t^{u,v^*}$ since the two probabilities are equivalent. In the same way we can show that $Y_t^{u^*,v} \leq Y_t$, $P - a.s.$ for any $t \leq T$ and any admissible control $(v_t)_{t \leq T}$. Therefore for any $t \leq T$ we have:

$$Y_t^{u^*,v} \leq Y_t \leq Y_t^{u,v^*}$$

and then

$$\text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \text{esssup}_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Y_t^{u,v} \leq Y_t \leq \text{esssup}_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v}$$

which ends the proof of (29).

We now focus on the main claim. So let us prove that:

$$\text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v} = \text{esssup}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_t} \text{essinf}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t} \text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma) \tag{30}$$

i.e. we can commute the control and the stopping times. So for any u, v and σ, τ let $(J_t, Z_t, r_t)_{t \leq \tau \wedge \sigma}$ be the solution of the following standard BSDE:

$$J_t = \bar{\xi} + \int_t^{\tau \wedge \sigma} H(s,z_s,r_s,u_s,v_s)ds - \int_t^{\tau \wedge \sigma} z_s dB_s - \int_t^{\tau \wedge \sigma} \int_E r_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de)$$

where $\bar{\xi} = U_\tau 1_{[\tau < \sigma]} + L_\sigma 1_{[\sigma \leq \tau < T]} + \xi 1_{[\tau = \sigma = T]}$. This solution exists thanks to a result by Tang & Li [36]. Therefore $P - a.s.$, for any $t \leq \tau \wedge \sigma$, we have $J_t = J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma)$.

We can now argue as in [13], Proposition 3.1, to obtain that:

$$\text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma) = \bar{\xi} + \int_t^{\tau \wedge \sigma} \text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} H(s,z_s,r_s,u_s,v_s)ds - \int_t^{\tau \wedge \sigma} z_s dB_s - \int_t^{\tau \wedge \sigma} \int_E r_s(e)\tilde{\mu}(ds,de).$$

Actually this is possible since we can use comparison of solutions of those BSDEs thanks to the properties satisfied by the mapping β and especially the fact that $\beta > -1$. Therefore the process $(\text{esssup}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_t} \text{essinf}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t} \text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma))_{t \leq T}$ is the value function of the corresponding Dynkin game, *i.e.* the solution of the RBSDE associated with $(\text{essinf}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} H(t,z,r,u,v), \xi, L, U)$.

On the other hand, once more using comparison of solutions of BSDEs with two reflecting barriers we obtain that the process $(\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v})_{t\leq T}$ is the solution (with the other components) of the RBSDE associated $(\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} H(t,z,r,u,v),\xi,L,U)$. Now by uniqueness we obtain: for any $t\leq T$,

$$\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v} = \text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma).$$

It follows that: $\forall t\leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= \text{essup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} Y_t^{u,v} = \text{essup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{essinf}_{u\in\mathcal{U}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma) \\ &= \text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_0,v\in\mathcal{V}}\text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_0,u\in\mathcal{U}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

In the same way we can show that:

$$\text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Y_t^{u,v} = \text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_t}\text{esssup}_{v\in\mathcal{V}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma)$$

which implies that:

$$Y_t = \text{essinf}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_0,u\in\mathcal{U}}\text{esssup}_{\sigma\in\mathcal{T}_0,v\in\mathcal{V}} J_t(u,\tau;v,\sigma),\ t\leq T.$$

Thus the proof of the claim is complete. □

Appendix

Lemma 5.1 *: If $(U^n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a non-decreasing sequence of progressively measurable rcll $\mathbb{R}$-valued processes of class [D] which converges pointwisely to U another progressively measurable rcll $\mathbb{R}$-valued process of class [D], then P-a.s., $\forall t\leq T$, $SN(U^n)_t \nearrow SN(U)_t$, where SN is the Snell envelope operator.*

The proof of this result has been given in several works (see e.g. Appendix in [23]) and then we omit it. □

References

[1] Ayache, E., Forsyth P.A., Vetzal K. R. : The Valuation of Convertible Bonds With Credit Risk, *Journal of Derivatives, fall (11), 2003, pp.9-29*

[2] K.Bahlali, S.Hamadène, B.Mezerdi: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers and continuous with quadratic growth corefficient, *Stochstic Processes and their Applications 115 (2005) 1107-1129*

[3] G.Barles, R.Buchdahn, E.Pardoux: Backward stochastic differential equations and integral-partial differential equations, *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports, vol.60, pp. 57-83*

[4] R.Bass: General Theory of Processes, *website: www.math.uconn.edu/ bass/gtp.pdf*

[5] A. Bensoussan, J.L. Lions: Contrôle impulsionnel et inéqualitions quasi variationnelles, *Dunod, Paris, 1982.*

[6] T.R. Bielecki, S.Crépey, M.Jeanblanc, M.Rutkowski: Defaultable options in a Markovian intensity model of credit risk, *Preprint* (2006)

[7] T.R. Bielecki, S.Crépey, M.Jeanblanc, M.Rutkowski: Defaultable Game Options in a Hazard Process Model, *Preprint* (2006)

[8] J.Cvitanic, I.Karatzas: Backward SDEs with reflection and Dynkin games, *Annals of Probability 24 (4), pp. 2024-2056 (1996)*

[9] C.Dellacherie, P.A.Meyer: Probabilités et Potentiel, *Chap. 1-4, Hermann, Paris (1975)*

[10] C.Dellacherie, P.A.Meyer: Probabilités et Potentiel, *Chap. 5-8, Hermann, Paris (1975)*

[11] N.El-Karoui, S.Hamadène: BSDEs and Risk-Sensitive Control, Zero-sum and Non zero-sum Game Problems of Stochastic Functional Differential Equations, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications 107 (2003), pp. 145-169*

[12] N.El-Karoui, C.Kapoudjian, E.Pardoux, S.Peng, M.C.Quenez: Reflected solutions of backward SDEs and related obstacle problems for PDEs, *Annals of Probability 25 (2) (1997), pp.702-737*

[13] N.El-Karoui, S.Peng, M.C.Quenez: Backward differential equations in finance, *Mathematical Finance, vol.7, no.1(1997), pp. 1-71*

[14] Essaky, E.H.: Reflected BSDEs with jumps and RCLL obstacle, *to appear in Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques (2008)*

[15] P.V.Gapeev, C.Kühn: Perpetual convertible bonds in jump-diffusion models, *Statistics and Decisions 23, 2005, pp.15-31*

[16] S.Hamadène: Mixed Zero-sum differential game and American game options, *SIAM J. Control Optim. 45 (2006), pp. 496-518*

[17] S.Hamadène, M.Hassani: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers: the general result, *Probability Theory and Related Fields 132, 237-264 (2005)*

[18] S.Hamadène, M.Hassani: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers driven by a Brownian motion and an independent Poisson noise and related Dynkin game, *EJP, vol. 11 (2006), paper no. 5, pp. 121-145. http://www.math.washington.edu/ ejpecp/*

[19] S.Hamadène, M.Hassani, Y.Ouknine: BSDEs with two general discontinuous reflecting barriers without Mokobodski's hypothesis, *preprint, Université du Maine, Le Mans (F.)*

[20] S.Hamadène, I. Hdhiri: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers and quadratic growth coefficient without Mokobodski's condition. Applications, *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Stochastic Analysis, vol.2006, Article SD 95818, p.1-28*

[21] S.Hamadène, J.-P.Lepeltier: Reflected BSDEs and mixed game problem, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications 85 (2000) p. 177-188*

[22] S. Hamadène, J.P.Lepeltier, A.Matoussi: Double barrier reflected BSDEs with continuous coefficient, *in: N.El-Karoui & L.Mazliak (Eds.), Pitman Research Notes Math. Series, vol.364, pp.115-128 (1997)*

[23] S. Hamadène, Y.Ouknine: Refelected Backward SDEs with general jumps, *preprint, Université du Maine, Le Mans (F.)*

[24] Kallsen, J. , Kühn, C.: Pricing Derivatives of American and game type in incomplete markets, *F*inance and Stochastics 8 (2004), pp.261-284

[25] Y. Kifer: Game options, *Finance and Stochastics* 4 (2000), pp.443-463

[26] F.H. Knight: Risk, Uncertainty and Profit, *Boston, MA.*

[27] Laraki, R. , Solan, E.: The value of zero-sum stopping games in continuous time, *SIAM Journal Control and Optimization, Vol. 43, N 5, pp.11913-1922 (2005)*

[28] J.P.Lepeltier, J.San Martin: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers and continuous coefficient: an existence result, *Journal of Applied Probability 41 (1), 162-175 (2004)*

[29] J.P. Lepeltier, M.A. Maingueneau: Le jeu de Dynkin en théorie générale sans l'hypothèse de Mokobodski, *Stochastics, vol.13, pp.25-44 (1984)*

[30] B.Øksendal, A.Sulem: Applied Stochastic Control of Jump Diffusions, *Springer Universitext, 2005*

[31] S.Peng: Monotonic limit theorem of BSDE and nonlinear decomposition theorem of Doob-Meyer's type, *Probability Theory and Related Fields 113, 473-499 (1999)*

[32] J.P. Lepeltier, M.Xu: Reflected BSDEs with two rcll barriers, *ESAIM: PS, Feb.20007, vol.11, p.3-22*

[33] S.Peng, Xu Mingyu: The smallest g-supermartingale and reflected BSDE with single and double L^2-obstacles, *Annales de l'IHP, PR(41) (2005), 605-630*

[34] Protter, E. P.: Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations, *2-nd Edition, Version 2.1., Springer B.H.N-Y (2000)*

[35] M. Sirbu, S.E.Sherve: A Two-Person Game for Pricing Convertible Bonds, *SIAM JCO, 2006, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 1508-1539*

[36] S.Tang, X.Li: Necessary condition for optimal control of stochastic systems with random jumps, *SIAM JCO 332, pp. 1447-1475, (1994).*

[37] N. Touzi, N. Vieille: Continuous-time Dynkin games with mixed strategies, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 41, 1073-1088 (2002)*